RESERVE STOCK

3/27002X

DEC 1952

The
Friday, C
8 p.m. (

WANDSWORTH
PUBLIC LIBRARIES

REFERENCE
BOOK

NOT TO BE TAKEN AWAY

III

500 631 200 FC

*T.S.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/trialofgeorgecha0000na

George Chapman

NOTABLE BRITISH TRIALS SERIES

General Editor—HARRY HODGE

Trial	Date of Trial	Editor
Mary Queen of Scots	(1586)	A. Francis Steuart
King Charles I.	(1649)	J. G. Muddiman
The Bloody Assizes	(1678)	J. G. Muddiman
Captain Porteous	(1736)	William Roughead
The Annesley Case	(1743)	Andrew Lang
Lord Lovat	(1747)	David N. Mackay
Mary Blandy	(1752)	William Roughead
James Stewart	(1752)	David N. Mackay
Eugene Aram	(1759)	Eric R. Watson
Katharine Nairn	(1765)	William Roughead
The Douglas Cause	(1761-1769)	A. Francis Steuart
Duchess of Kingston	(1776)	Lewis Melville
Deacon Brodie	(1788)	William Roughead
Abraham Thornton	(1817)	Sir John Hall, Bt.
Henry Fauntleroy	(1824)	Horace Bleackley
Thurtell and Hunt	(1824)	Eric R. Watson
Burke and Hare	(1828)	William Roughead
J. B. Rush	(1849)	W. Teignmouth Shore
William Palmer	(1856)	Eric R. Watson
Madeleine Smith	(1858)	F. Tennyson Jesse
Mrs. M'Lachlan	(1862)	William Roughead
Franz Muller	(1864)	H. B. Irving
Dr. Pritchard	(1865)	William Roughead
The Wainwrights	(1875)	H. B. Irving
The Stauntons	(1877)	J. B. Atlay
E. M. Chantrelle	(1878)	A. Duncan Smith
Kate Webster	(1879)	Elliott O'Donnell
City of Glasgow Bank	(1879)	William Wallace
Charles Peace	(1879)	W. Teignmouth Shore
Dr. Lamson	(1882)	H. L. Adam
Adelaide Bartlett	(1886)	Sir John Hall, Bt.
Mrs. Maybrick	(1889)	H. B. Irving
T. N. Cream	(1892)	W. Teignmouth Shore
A. J. Monson	(1893)	J. W. More
G. Chapman	(1903)	H. L. Adam
S. H. Dougal	(1903)	F. Tennyson Jesse
Adolf Beck	(1904)	Eric R. Watson
Oscar Slater	(1909-1928)	William Roughead
H. H. Crippen	(1910)	Filson Young
J. A. Dickman	(1910)	S. O. Rowan-Hamilton
Steinie Morrison	(1911)	H. Fletcher Moulton
The Seddons	(1912)	Filson Young
George Joseph Smith	(1915)	Eric R. Watson
Sir Roger Casement	(1916)	George H. Knott
Bywaters and Thompson	(1922)	Filson Young
Ronald True	(1922)	Donald Carswell
H. R. Armstrong	(1922)	Filson Young
J. P. Vaquier	(1924)	R. H. Blundell R. E. Seaton
J. D. Merrett	(1927)	William Roughead
Browne and Kennedy	(1928)	W. Teignmouth Shore.

IN PREPARATION.

Captain Kidd	Field and Gray
Dr. Smethurst	Queen Caroline
Harold Greenwood	Gardiner (Peasenhall)
"Bounty" Mutineers	Sydney H. Fox

Wm. Hodge & Co., Ltd., Edinburgh and London

Trial of

George Chapman

NEWNES PUBLIC LIBRARY,
PUTNEY.

EDITED BY

Hargrave L. Adam
Editor of "Trial of Dr. Lamson"

CLASS No. 343 · 1
CHARGE No. 24002
50

EDINBURGH AND LONDON
WILLIAM HODGE & COMPANY, LIMITED

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY
WILLIAM HODGE AND COMPANY, LIMITED
GLASGOW AND EDINBURGH
April, 1930

To

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LORD CARSON OF DUNCAIRN, P.C., LL.D.

WITH HIS CORDIAL AGREEMENT

I DEDICATE THIS VOLUME

PREFACE.

In editing this volume I experienced much difficulty with counsel's speeches, being unable to obtain a full report of them. Reports from various sources were, however, carefully compared, and as full an account as possible has been furnished. Fortunately, the evidence was to be found in the official Central Criminal Court Session Papers, and I obtained in the Home Office a verbatim transcript of the judge's summing up.

For invaluable aid my thanks are due to Sir Archibald Bodkin, the Director of Public Prosecutions; to Lord Carson, who has, among other kindnesses, accepted the dedication of this volume; to Mr. Cecil Chapman, the former metropolitan magistrate, and Dr. J. F. Waldo, the well-known city coroner, both of whom have assisted in making this volume a complete record; and, lastly, for much information, to ex-Chief-Inspector Godley, who probably knows more than any one else about the life and career of this criminal.

H. L. A.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Introduction, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1

Leading Dates, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 53

THE TRIAL—

FIRST DAY—MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1903.

Opening Speech for the Prosecution, - - - - - - - - - 57

Evidence for Prosecution.

Wolff Levisohn, - - - - 62
Mrs. Ethel Radin, - - - 63
Stanislaus Baderski, - - - 64
Mrs. Stanislaus Rauch, - 64
Alfred Wicken, - - - - 65
Mrs. Stanislaus Rauch (recalled), 66
William Lenion Bray, - 66
George Godley, - - - - 66
Joseph Betrikowski, - - 67
George Schumann, - 68
William Henry Davidson, - - 68

SECOND DAY—TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1903.

Evidence for Prosecution (continued).

Mrs. Eliza Marsh, - - - 72
Robert Marsh, - - - - 81
Mrs. Louisa Sarah Morris, - 84
Daisy Harriet Helen Marsh, - 89
Alice May Marsh, - - 90
Mrs. Jessie Toon, - - - 91
Louisa Beatrice Cole, - - - 96
Dr. James Henry Targett, - - 97
Florence Rayner, - 98
Annie Chapman, - - - 100
Dr. Francis Gaspard Grapel, - 102

THIRD DAY—WEDNESDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1903.

Evidence for Prosecution (continued).

Dr. James Maurice Stoker, - - 104
Richard Bodmer, - - - - 111
Frank Lovell Gilbert, - - - 112
Joseph Henry Vaughan Marks, - 113
Dr. Thomas Stevenson, - - 113
Richard Bodmer (recalled), - 121, 133
Dr. Ludwig Freyberger, - - 121
George Godley (recalled), - 121, 131
Mrs. Eliza Marsh (recalled), - 122
William Wenzel, - - - - 122
[illegible]ph Smith Renton, - - - 122
J[illegible]n Ward, - - - - - 123
[illegible]ur Neil, - - - - 123
Annie Helsdown, - - 123
Mrs. Harriet Greenaway, - 124
Mrs. Martha Doubleday, 125
Mrs. Jane Mumford, - - - 127
Mrs. Elizabeth Waymark, - 128
Henry Edward Pierce, - 130
Dr. Thomas Stevenson (recalled), 131
William Taylor, - - - - 133
Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Painter, - 134
Mrs. Martha Stevens, - - 137
Dr. James Maurice Stoker (recalled), - - - - 140
Arthur Neil (recalled), - 143
William Tull, - - - - 143
William Kelsall, - - - - 143

FOURTH DAY—THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1903.

Evidence for Prosecution (concluded).

[illegible]mas Stevenson (recalled), 144
Bodmer (recalled), - - 146
George Godley (recalled), - - 146
William Kemp, - - - - 149

PAGE

Closing Speech for the Defence, - - - - - - - - - - 149
Closing Speech for the Prosecution, - - - - - - - - - 151
Summing Up, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 152
The Verdict, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 164
Sentence, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 164

APPENDICES.

I. The Coroner's Inquest, - - - - - - - - - - - 169

Mrs. Louisa Sarah Morris, - - 169
Alice May Marsh, - - - 171
Mrs. Jessie Toon, - - 171, 176
Louisa Cole, - - - - 172
Frank L. Gilbert, - - - 172
Dr. J. H. Targett, - - 172, 177
Dr. James Morris Stoker, - 172, 177
Dr. Francis Gaspar Grapel, 175, 178
Detective-Insp. Godley, - - 176
Mrs. Marsh, - - - - 176
Dr. L. Freyberger, - - - 176
Dr. Stevenson, - - - - 177
Richard Bodmer, - - - 178

II. Police Court Proceedings, - - - - - - - - - - 180

Re THE MURDER OF MAUD MARSH.

Detective-Insp. Godley, - - 181
Robert Marsh, - - - - 183
Mrs. Eliza Marsh, - - 183, 186
Mrs. Louisa Sarah Morris, - - 185
Alice May Marsh, - - - 186
Daisy Harriet Helen Marsh, - 186
Mrs. Jessie Toon, - - 186, 187
Louisa Beatrice Cole, - - 188, 189
Dr. James Henry Targett, - 189
Frank Gilbert, - - - - 189
Joseph Henry Vaughan Marks, - 189
Dr. Francis Gaspar Grapel, - - 190
Dr. James Morris Stoker, - 190, 196
Richard Bodmer, - - 192, 194
Dr. Thomas Stevenson, - - 193
William Henry Davidson, - - 194
Florence Rayner, - - - 195
Detective-Sergeant Kemp, - - 196
Alfred Smith, - - - - 197

Re THE MURDERS OF MRS. SPINK AND BESSIE TAYLOR.

Detective-Insp. Godley, 200, 207, 209, 213, 214
Wolff Levisohn, - - - - 201
Stanislaus Baderski, - - - 202
Mrs. Stanislaus Rauch, - - 202
Joseph Smith Renton, - - 202
John Ward, - - - - 203
Mrs. Ethel Raydin, - - - 203
William Bray, - - - - 204
George Sterman, - - - - 204
Mrs. Helsdown, - - - - 204
Mrs. Harriet Greenaway, - 205
Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Martin, - 205
Alfred Constable, - - - 205
Alice Penfold, - - - - 205
Mrs. Martha Doubleday, - - 206
Henry Sacre, - - - - 207
F. G. Langham, - - - - 208
William Joseph Glenister, - - 208
Francis H. Owen, - - - 208
W. J. Clilverd, - - - - 208
J. Petrickovski, - - - - 209
Mrs. Jane Mumford, - - - 209
Mrs. Susan Pagett, - - - 209
Mrs. Elizabeth Waymark, - - 210
John Klaiber, - - - - 211
William Henry Stringer, - - 211
Ernest Sibley, - - - - 211
Dr. Thomas Stevenson, - - 212
Detective-Sergeant Neil, - - 213
Elizabeth Painter, - - - 213
Martha Elizabeth Ibbs, - - 213
Mrs. Martha Stevens, - - - 213
William Tull, - - - - 214
William Kelsall, - - - - 214
William Taylor, - - - - 215
Frederick Thomas Sanderson, - 215
Dr. James Morris Stoker, - - 216
Dr. Thomas Stevenson, - - 217

III. Translation of Documents found in Chapman's possession, - - - 219

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

George Chapman, - - - - - - - - - - - *Frontispiece*
Maud Marsh and George Chapman, - - - - - - *facing page* 17
Bessie Taylor and George Chapman, - - - - - - ,, 33
Plan of Murder in Whitechapel, - - - - - - - ,, 49
Sir Edward Carson, K.C., - - - - - - - - ,, 65
Mr. Charles Mathews, - - - - - - - - - ,, 81
Mr. A. H. Bodkin, - - - - - - - - - - ,, 97
Mr. George Elliott, - - - - - - - - - - ,, 129
Mr. Arthur Hutton, - - - - - - - - - - ,, 145
Mr. Justice Grantham, - - - - - - - - - ,, 161
Mr. Cecil Chapman, - - - - - - - - - ,, 177

GEORGE CHAPMAN
(Severin Klosowski).

INTRODUCTION.

I. Severin Antoniovich Klosowski.

On the 14th of December, 1865, in Nargornak, a village in the district of Kolo, Poland, Emilie, wife of a carpenter, Antonio Klosowski, gave birth to a male child. The boy was christened Severin. In due course he went to a primary school. His parents intended him for a medical career, and at the age of fifteen they apprenticed him to a surgeon named Moshko Rappaport, in the town of Zvolen. He remained with Rappaport for five or six years, and during that time he obtained numerous certificates to the effect that he gave every satisfaction, studied diligently, and exhibited general aptitude. On the expiry of his apprenticeship he tried to obtain the degree of a junior surgeon, but whether or not he was successful in this effort is not known. There is no evidence to indicate that the degree was ever granted, although Klosowski certainly applied for it. In Poland he does not seem ever to have occupied more than the ordinary position of hospital assistant or "barber-surgeon." However, whilst occupying this position in different parts of the country, he was again successful in collecting many documents of a flattering nature.* Of these the most interesting is one purporting to come from the magistrate of a district in which he had lived, and testifying that he was well-behaved, and "had never been found guilty of any crime whatever." It is not known what occasion called forth this guarantee of good behaviour, but if the testimonial were true, Klosowski was yet to remedy this omission in most remarkable fashion.

As regards his occupation of "barber-surgeon," which, by the way, is technically known in Poland as *Feldscher*, it may be noted that his professional knowledge included that of a hairdresser. The two professions—if hairdressing may

* See Appendix III.

be so called—were apparently combined. That these two different callings should be united may now, perhaps, seem surprising; but much the same kind of thing existed at one time in our own country, when barbers were also employed in bleeding, cupping, and so forth. That is the origin of the red-and-white sign of the barber's pole, which formerly also had a pendant brass cup, like the vessel made use of to receive blood in the process of bleeding. It is probable that the cup disappeared contemporaneously with the discontinuance of the murderous "cure" of blood-letting.

At the age of twenty one, when he was employed as assistant surgeon in a hospital at Praga, Klosowski left his situation suddenly, journeyed to Warsaw, and there enlisted in the Russian army. The term of his military service was of short duration. About eighteen months afterwards he sailed for England.

It is not definitely known when Klosowski landed in this country. His advent, however, can be traced to within a comparatively short period of time. Through the medium of a receipt for hospital fees paid at Warsaw—a document found in Klosowski's possesion after his arrest—it appears that he was there in March, 1887. In Warsaw he met a man named Levisohn, a hairdresser's traveller, who again saw and recognised Klosowski in this country about 1888 or 1889. Levisohn understood that Klosowski had not then been long in England. As is the invariable custom with Poles who migrate to this country, he went direct to Whitechapel, obtaining a situation in the High Street as a hairdresser's assistant. This was where Levisohn met him again, the former having, in the pursuit of his business, to call at barbers' shops. For some reason or other not explained he was known here as "Ludwig" Klosowski.

Being of a most restless disposition, Klosowski did not remain long in his first English situation. After leaving the High Street shop, he obtained another situation in a barber's shop in West Green Road, South Tottenham, where he was again encountered by the somewhat inevitable Levisohn, this shop being another of the latter's places of call. Here Klosowski was known among his fellow English assistants as "Schloski," which appears to have been the nearest they could get to pronouncing his rather peculiar

name—peculiar, that is, to English ears. Subsequently Klosowski acquired a shop for himself in the High Road, Tottenham. But this venture failed, and he was compelled to return once more to the position of assistant. Little daunted, it would seem, by the failure of his first business enterprise, he continued his wanderings. For several months he was employed by a hairdresser named Radin, at Rushton Street, Shoreditch, and later he went to a shop in Church Lane, Leytonstone, where he received 30s. a week, besides being described as "quiet, steady, and industrious." At Leytonstone in 1895 he became acquainted with a Mrs. Spink, and in a remarkably short space of time the relationship between them developed into more than that of friendship. But before this matter is proceeded with, it will be as well to deal, as far as one can, with the earlier matrimonial affairs of Severin Klosowski.

It is indeed probable that he was already married before he came to this country. At any rate, a woman came to England from either Russia or Poland, and claimed him as her husband. Her arrival, however, was at a most inopportune time, for Klosowski, who had been without female companionship for as long as he could possibly endure, had already gone through a marriage ceremony with another woman. The two women met at his house. Both claimed the distinction of being the real wife, and neither would give way to the other. For some time the two women actually lived in the same building with this enterprising barber. The records do not concern themselves with the kind of life led by the man during the struggle between his devoted spouses, but probably it was not without considerable excitement. At length one of the women went away—disappeared—leaving the other mistress of the situation. The one who remained was the more recently wedded one, a Polish woman, whose maiden name was Lucy Baderski. She was a sister of a tailor at Walthamstow, and Klosowski met her at a Polish club in St. John's Square, Clerkenwell. Their marriage took place on the August Bank Holiday of 1889. For some time the two lived together at Cable Street, but subsequently they removed to Greenfield Street. Then they went to America. But soon afterwards, in February, 1891, the wife came back to this country by herself, leaving her

husband in the United States. There had been a rift within the lute, brought about by the too open and ardent attentions paid by the barber-surgeon to other women; these were marks of affection which Mrs. Klosowski properly considered to be her due and right.

Shortly after his wife's return Klosowski also came back to London and reappeared in the East End. In his pocket-book, after his arrest, was found a slip of paper, with the following entry which has a bearing on this time: "Came from America in 1893, independent. Deposits £100, when from America I had £1000." The words are hardly intelligible, but the statement about his means was certainly untrue. He had little or no money when he returned from America. Nevertheless, his wife returned to him, prepared apparently to forgive his waywardness, and the two lived together for some time. But Mrs. Klosowski was again so upset by her husband's insistent and open immorality that she left him, fortunately for ever. There were two children of the marriage, but Klosowski made no effort to retain the custody of them.

Meanwhile, he had returned to hairdressing. He could not, however, live without a female companion of some sort, and his lawful wife had not been gone long before he met a young woman named Annie Chapman. They lived together for about a year; then she, too, left him—and survived. From this episode in his disreputable life there arose an important change in the identity of the barber-surgeon. He adopted the surname of the woman with whom he had been cohabiting, calling himself George Chapman. Apparently by this change of name he sought to avoid the obligations that were his as a result of alliances with different women. He never again acknowledged the name of Klosowski. It is on record that, after the police had established to their satisfaction that their prisoner, George Chapman, was in fact Severin Klosowski, an officer asked him for an admission to that effect, but he received only the laconic reply, "I don't know anything about that fellow"!

Immediately after he had thus concealed his identity, he commenced, apparently with a fixed determination in his mind, a series of crimes which ranged from the capital offence

to lesser illegal acts. His operations were characterised with remarkable recklessness and daring, having for their primary purpose and *idée fixe* the pursuit, the capture, and the destruction of women.

When Annie Chapman left him he met the first of the three victims with whom alone the prosecution concerned itself.

II. The Deaths of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor.

In 1895, while working at Leytonstone, "George Chapman" was living with a family named Renton. One of the Rentons—Mary Isabella Renton—was married to a man named Shadrach Spink, a porter employed by the Great Eastern Railway Company. At a period in her married life Mrs. Spink developed intemperate habits, and as a result her husband left her, taking with him the only child of the marriage, a boy. Shortly afterwards Mrs. Spink gave birth to another child, also a boy, who was christened William.

Chapman then left the Renton's house and went to lodge with a man named Ward. Spink had not been gone very long when Mrs. Spink and Chapman were seen about together a good deal; so much so, in fact, as to cause Mr. Ward to comment upon it. Chapman thereupon explained the intimate association by stating that they were going to be married. One day in October, 1895, they did in fact go out together for this purpose, declaring upon their return that they had been married. Henceforth they lived openly as man and wife. The supposed marriage was undoubtedly a pretence. As both were already married, and there had been no divorces, a genuine marriage would have constituted bigamy on the two sides. It is unlikely that the police could have overlooked what was, in Mrs. Spink's case at any rate, such an apparent offence.

Up till this time Chapman had had a situation as a hairdresser's assistant, but as Mrs. Spink had private means he was eventually enabled to give up this work. Mrs. Spink's grandfather had left her nearly £600, the money being vested in a trust for her benefit. Soon after taking up with Chapman the trustees advanced her £250. Subsequently, in 1897, the balance, a little over £300, was paid

over to a legal firm representing "Mr. and Mrs. Chapman." There can be no doubt that most, probably all, of this money passed into the possession of Chapman. With the first instalment he took the lease of a small shop in Hastings. The establishment, being situated in a poor part of the town, did not prosper. He soon left it for an old-established hairdressing business in George Street, behind the Albion, in Old Hastings. This was a lock-up shop, and the two lived in rooms close by. Chapman was assisted in his business by his female companion, who, of course, was regarded as his wife. She was short and plump, and had blonde hair, which was cut as short as that of a man—an anticipation of a general fashion which was at that time a long way off. In another respect this lady was a social pioneer. Lady hairdressers were unknown at the end of last century, yet Mrs. Spink lathered all her husband's customers; later she even on occasions tried shaving them. But this was largely by way of experiment, and she did not persevere with it. Possibly these novel shaves by a woman, who was not always in full possession of her senses, received but slight support from the public.

The couple still had with them the little boy, Willie, who sometimes slept in the shop and quite frequently in a foul cellar below the premises. His mother explained his presence to curious customers by saying that he was the child of her first marriage; her first husband, she said, had been a doctor. The reason for this lie does not appear, unless it was merely foolish female affectation to convert a railway porter into a medical man. In any event, it seems that the boy led a most unhappy and neglected life.

At the commencement of business in the Hastings shop, notwithstanding the very free nature of the female assistance, results were disappointing. Accordingly, another improvement scheme was tried. As Mrs. Spink could play the piano, Chapman hired an instrument, and installed it in the front of his shop. After lathering customers, the lady assistant would sit down at the piano and play. These "musical shaves" quickly became popular, and business as a result improved. So great, indeed, was the improvement that Chapman was able to afford a small sailing-and-rowing boat, which he named the "Mosquito." He boasted to his

customers that he would sail her across to Boulogne, but this never eventuated. He restricted himself to short cruises with Mrs. Spink. On those occasions he was always appropriately dressed in nautical attire. He was generally regarded as a hazardous person rather than as a skilful sailor, and upon one occasion the boat capsized and the occupants were nearly drowned. Only a timely rescue by fishermen saved them. In the light of subsequent events one would like to know how this accident happened. It would be interesting, too, to know if both, or only one, of the occupants of the boat could swim; particularly as the two were not then living very happily together, on account, it was thought, of the lady's habitual drunkenness. But although there is no evidence to clear up the point, no injustice is being done, in view of Chapman's later crimes, in not giving him the benefit of the doubt. Chapman and his companion had only been at the Hastings shop for six months when it was sold to a Mr. Robinson, a neighbouring furniture dealer. On the day following the sale, Chapman, Mrs. Spink, and the boy left Hastings. But two incidents that occurred before this are worthy of narration.

Among the customers at Chapman's shop was a Mr. Davidson, a chemist, carrying on business in the High Street, who used to come occasionally to be shaved. The barber and the chemist had many conversations together, during which Mr. Davidson gathered that Chapman had considerable medical knowledge. One day Chapman asked him if he might purchase some tartar emetic, and Davidson consented to sell him some. Shortly afterwards Chapman called and asked for an ounce of the poison. Davidson gave it to him in white powder form, contained in a wide-mouthed bottle. Upon the latter he fixed an appropriate label, on which he wrote "Poison. Tartar emetic. Dose—One-sixth of a grain to a quarter. To be taken with caution." Davidson also requested Chapman to sign his poisons book, as required by law, and the latter accordingly signed "G. Chapman." A reason had to be given for the purchase, and Chapman added something which was difficult to read, but which Mr. Davidson said looked like the word "take." Fortunately, Mr. Davidson kept his poisons book, in which the signature was found.

While at Hastings Chapman had a flirtation with a young woman named Alice Penfold, a domestic servant. One Sunday evening, while she was out walking, she was accosted by Chapman, who said he was a single man and the manager of a pianoforte shop. Subsequently she met him several times. On one occasion, on his remarking that she looked ill, Alice Penford replied that she had a cold. He then said that he had served in a hospital and would prepare something to relieve her. He sent her some powders which, however, she destroyed. When he next met her he said he intended to take a public-house at St. Leonards, and asked her to come and see it. She went and afterwards returned to Hastings. He probably took her to a public-house of some sort and told her he was going to purchase it. She did not see him again, but she heard from him. He wrote from the Prince of Wales Tavern, St. Luke's, London, asking her to come and see him. She did not go, and that was the last she heard of him until his arrest.

For a period after their departure from Hastings there is a vacant space in the account of the movements of Chapman and Mrs. Spink. The story is resumed, however, with Chapman's acceptance of the lease of the Prince of Wales Tavern, in Bartholomew Square, off the City Road. Up to this point in her life Mrs. Spink had been a remarkably healthy woman, the only maladies, if such they may be termed, which she had yet been called upon to combat, being the evil after-effects of frequent drinking bouts. It was astonishing, therefore, that, after only a few months of life at the Prince of Wales, this long spell of good health should completely break down. Mrs. Spink was soon confined to bed suffering from severe vomiting attacks and distressing abdominal pains. Chapman engaged a neighbour, Mrs. Martha Doubleday, primarily to attend to the public bar during Mrs. Spink's indisposition, but also to devote a little time to the sick woman. Mrs. Doubleday recognised at once that medical treatment was necessary for Mrs. Spink; acting, however unwillingly, on her suggestion, Chapman called in Dr. Rogers. The latter prescribed medicines, but otherwise played a subordinate part in the attentions to the patient; Chapman himself prepared and administered the doctor's

prescriptions. Mrs. Spink slowly became weaker, lingered on the brink of death for several days after her case had been pronounced hopeless, and died on the morning of Christmas Day, 1897. To her few friends the woman's death seemed to be a merciful, though perhaps delayed, deliverance from the tortures of a protracted illness. In the eyes of those who were present at the end, Chapman was an attached husband, prostrated with grief. Consequently, strong feelings of sympathy were formed for the afflicted publican; but these must have been disturbed not a little when Chapman opened his premises at the usual time on the day of the death. Dr. Rogers made no trouble at all about granting a death certificate; in the document he ascribed death to phthisis! He was doubtless largely influenced in this conclusion by the emaciated state of Mrs. Spink. The woman's funeral was a quiet one; she was buried in a common grave at Leyton. The whist club in the district of the Prince of Wales tavern subscribed for a handsome wreath, and several customers of the house followed the cortege to the cemetery.

Thus the deluded wife of humble Shadrach Spink passed from notice, though not from memory. In her common grave at Leyton the bodies of other deceased persons, in no way related to her, were deposited above her body. Yet securely and remotely as she lay, she was by no means beyond the reach of the hand of justice.

A few months after Mrs. Spink's death Chapman advertised for a barmaid. He had many replies, considered several, and finally fixed on a young woman named Elizabeth Taylor, known as Bessie Taylor. She had formerly been a domestic servant, and was the daughter of Thomas Parsonage Taylor, a farmer and cattle dealer of Warrington. She had not been long in Chapman's service when he "married" her. That is to say, they drove away one Sunday, presumably to be married at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark. As in the case of Mrs. Spink, there was, of course, no genuine marriage. There was no honeymoon, and they were serving in the bar that same evening. Like her unfortunate predecessor, Bessie Taylor was known as "Mrs. Chapman." As a single woman she had enjoyed good health, but after

her "marriage" her health began to fail. She became thinner—began to waste away. Chapman gave up the Prince of Wales, going to Bishops Stortford and taking a public-house called the Grapes. Here, a friend and former fellow-servant of Bessie's, Elizabeth Painter, visited her and stayed a fortnight. She later described that she found her friend suffering from "lumps in her face, caused by her teeth." After Painter left the Grapes, Bessie was obliged to go into hospital to undergo an operation. When she came out again Chapman's manner towards her had greatly altered; he was cruel to her, abusing her a good deal, and even going so far as to threaten her with a revolver.

Soon the Grapes was given up. Chapman now returned to London, where he took the Monument Tavern in Union Street, Borough, which he leased from the Bridge House Estates Committee. "Mrs. Chapman's" health continued to fail, she grew thinner, and Chapman's unkindness towards her also became more pronounced, extending even to physical violence. She had several doctors to attend her, but none of them could fully understand her case. Then Dr. Stoker, recommended by a nurse who was in attendance, was called in. Dr. Stoker was no more successful than the other doctors. On one occasion, however, the patient did get a little better and she was able to sit at the piano and play. Dr. Stoker came in, saw her, said "Capital!" rubbed his hands, and was very pleased. The nurse was sent home. Two days later the poor woman was dying. Dr. Stoker was, of course, most surprised. This was her last attack; she died in the early hours of 13th February, 1901. Dr. Stoker gave a certificate, and this time death was attributed to "exhaustion from vomiting and diarrhœa."

Bessie Taylor was held in high esteem by the customers of the Monument and the surrounding neighbours. She had been much liked, being very genial with the customers and charitable to the poor. At Christmas time she had given away little dainties made by her own hands. She had been an expert cyclist, and prior to her illness used to practise up and down the road after the house was closed. The clergy attached to All Hallow's, Pepper Street, attended her during her illness, as also did two of the Sisters from the same place.

For these attentions Chapman expressed himself to be grateful. She was buried at Lynn, in Cheshire, five miles from her native village. On her grave there is a mourning card which reads: "In loving memory of Bessie Chapman, wife of George Chapman, and the daughter of Thomas P. and Betsy Taylor, who died February 13, 1901, aged 36 years, and was interred at Lynn, February 15." Then follows this verse, which savours very strongly of Chapman and may have been his own composition:

Farewell, my friends, fond and dear,
Weep not for me one single tear;
For all that was and could be done,
You plainly see my time was come.

The parents of Bessie Taylor had been surprised to hear of the hurried marriage of their daughter; when they received this news, they did not even know that she was engaged. She visited her home several times subsequent to her meeting and living with Chapman, and always spoke well of her "husband." The Taylors also visited their daughter at the Monument, when Chapman succeeded in very favourably impressing them, so much so that Mrs. Taylor said that she "had never seen a better husband." They were unaware that Chapman had been previously married. On one occasion the Taylors sent their daughter £50, which Chapman intercepted and annexed. They did not long survive their daughter. Taylor died in the June of the same year, and Mrs. Taylor in the following August, the same month in which Chapman answered Maud Marsh's advertisement.

III. Maud Marsh—The Last Victim.

In August, 1901, while he was still lessee of the Monument Tavern, Union Street, Borough, a young woman named Maud Marsh advertised for a situation as barmaid. The advertisement was seen by Chapman, who replied to it, and eventually engaged the young woman for the Monument. Maud Marsh was then living with her parents at Croydon, her father being a labourer. The parents of the girl were naturally keen to know to what sort of place their daughter

contemplated going, and therefore, before Maud was finally engaged, Mrs. Marsh went with her to the Monument. Mrs. Marsh had a short interview with Chapman, in which the latter made two untrue statements. He told her that he was a bachelor, and that he did not live alone in the house: the upper part, he said, was occupied by another family. These false statements were calculated to remove any doubts that Mrs. Marsh had about the character of the place, and they appeared, temporarily at least, to do so. Mrs. Marsh raised no objection to her daughter taking the situation.

Maud Marsh had not been long at the Monument when she wrote to her mother saying that her employer had given her a present of a gold watch and chain. This piece of news alarmed Mrs. Marsh, and her uneasiness was greatly increased soon afterwards by this remarkable letter which she received from her daughter :—

Monument, Borough, S.E.

Dear Mother,—Just a line to say on the Q.T. Mr. has gone out, so I now write this to you to say that George says if I do not let him have what he wants he will give me 35 lbs (£35) and send me home. What shall I do? It does worry me so; but still I am engaged, so it will not matter much, and if he does not marry me I can have a breach of promise, can't I? I must close, with love. Write soon. I remain your loving daughter, MAUD.

P.S.—I have sent this without him knowing. Love to all. Let me know how papa is.

Mrs. Marsh at once wrote strongly reproving Maud and told her to come home. The girl, in a second letter, declined to do so; this letter practically contradicted the first one. Maud said it had been very foolish of her to have written in such a way. An early visit to her mother was also promised, and on the following Sunday she arrived at Croydon, accompanied by the amorous Chapman. The latter declared that he wished to marry Maud, and apparently to gain the good graces of Mr. and Mrs. Marsh, and incidentally to further his suit, he produced what he termed a "will," signed it, and had it "witnessed" by Mrs. Marsh and a son. This document purported to bequeath £400 to "my wife"; it was, of course, of absolutely no value.

A few weeks later Maud's father, still very much concerned about his daughter's position, visited her at the Monument. She told him that her employer had been

"paying her attentions." He had, she said, been very attentive to her, and had on more than one occasion proposed marriage. Her father does not seem to have been satisfied that Chapman's motives were of an honourable kind. He advised her not to do anything in a secret or underhand way, and to let him know all that happened. Unfortunately the girl did not at the time take his good advice, and when Marsh subsequently became ill and went to hospital she disregarded it altogether. Marsh, on his daughter visiting him in hospital, noticed a ring on her finger, and he immediately asked her if she were married. Without hesitation the girl told him that her employer had married her in a Roman Catholic "room" in Bishopsgate Street. (Chapman was a Roman Catholic; it has often been wrongfully stated that he was a Jew.)

This so-called wedding of Chapman and Maud Marsh was merely another of the bogus ceremonies of the kind which Chapman had previously practised. He wished to deceive the friends of Maud Marsh, and, as far as possible, to deceive her relatives; she herself was, like the other women, a party to the deception. The "ceremony" was very simple. After having freely circulated the news that they were going away to be married, the couple set off in a carriage and, having driven around the town for some time, returned to the congratulations and the confetti of the customers of the Monument. But the joy of the happy pair was perhaps a trifle marred by the arrival of Mrs. Marsh, still a very anxious woman. She, unlike the frequenters of the hostelry, was not ready to accept at once the story of the supposed marriage; and all the smooth lies of Chapman could not remove from her head the strong doubts that she had formed. Unfortunately for Chapman, these doubts were never to be entirely removed; they grew and developed from the time of the "marriage" until eventually they proved instrumental in bringing one of the most dangerous of criminals to justice.

It is quite clear, therefore, that except during her first visit to the Monument, when she gave her daughter permission to accept the offered situation, Mrs. Marsh placed no faith in Chapman. But even more apparent was the disbelief of the man Marsh in the sincerity of the publican.

When Maud told him that Chapman had married her, he immediately threw doubt upon the truth of her statement by asking to be shown the marriage certificate. Thus he inferred that she was in a position that must be abhorrent to the mind of every ordinary woman. How positive he must have been that no marriage had in effect taken place! As it was, Maud was unable to feign indignation at her father's doubts. She tried unsuccessfully to persuade him that everything was all right, and in doing so probably further implicated herself. At any rate, her answers to his questions were most unsatisfactory. She lamely replied to him that her husband was keeping the marriage certificate, and that they had made up their minds so suddenly to get married that there had been no time to let him know beforehand. How little effect these statements had upon the doubting Marsh need hardly be expressed.

Soon afterwards a mysterious illness of "Mrs. Chapman" began at the Monument. She suffered excessively from sickness, vomiting, diarrhœa, abdominal pains, and general distress. She became so ill that she was sent off to Guy's Hospital. There her illness puzzled the doctors, who diagnosed it in several ways—incipient cancer, internal rheumatism, acute dyspepsia—all very far from being correct. However, their treatment proving efficacious, largely, of course, due to her being from home and from the attentions of her "husband," she gradually recovered, and was able in a short time to return home. Shortly after her return the mysterious illness, with exactly the same symptoms, recurred. Chapman was unwilling this time for Maud to return to Guy's to be restored, and consequently Dr. Stoker, who practised in the New Kent Road, was called in. Dr. Stoker, too, was for some time completely baffled about the cause of the trouble, and, as a result, the assistance which he gave was at first of no practical value whatever. The medicine that he prescribed had little or no effect, and the patient grew gradually, yet very steadily, worse. No doubt the bewilderment of the doctor was greatly increased by the fact that not long ago he had attended and prescribed for another "wife" of Chapman, who had died at the Monument.

Meanwhile Chapman had left the Monument and had taken a lease of the Crown public-house in Union Street, Borough.

Dr. Stoker continued to visit and prescribe for his patient, who was now failing rapidly. Mrs. Marsh now considered the time opportune to render some help to her stricken daughter, and accordingly she came from Croydon to nurse her. The young woman could give no good reason for the cause of her second attack; she said that some rabbit which she had eaten on the previous Sunday might have been the cause of her sickness, but Mrs. Marsh wisely pointed out that no one else in the house had experienced similar ill-effects. Although Mrs. Marsh was in constant attendance upon her daughter, and the services of another woman, a customer named Toon, had also been enlisted to assist in nursing, Chapman was most particular that all food to be given to the patient should be prepared by himself. And it did not matter whether it was food or drink that he prepared and administered, the sick woman became decidedly worse after taking it. Finally, there came a time when she was unable to swallow solid food of any kind; she could swallow only liquids, often with much difficulty, and always with the same evil after-effects. Once Chapman prepared a brandy-and-soda drink for the patient, but, as she was then very weak, most of the brandy was left in the glass. During the day Mrs. Marsh and the nurse refreshed themselves with a little of this brandy, and both soon afterwards had painful attacks of vomiting and diarrhœa. It was indeed perilous for any one either to eat or to drink in that house.

Although all these mysterious and significant things were happening at the Crown, how strange it was that for a long time no suspicion of foul play arose in the mind of anybody! Dr. Stoker, the only medical man in attendance, entertained no shadow of suspicion that his patient was being poisoned, and consequently could find no cause for her gradually weakening condition. By this time Mr. Marsh and another daughter were there, but they, too, did not doubt that Maud's illness was other than a natural one. Of course, Chapman appeared to be very attentive to his "wife"; he was in constant attendance in the sick room, from time to time testing the patient's pulse with professional confidence. On one occasion somebody asked him if his "wife" were better, and he replied, "No, she's dying." It is interesting that

this remark was made before Dr. Stoker entertained any idea of losing his patient. At long last a definite suspicion arose in the mind of Mrs. Marsh. It is not surprising that suspicion of Chapman first came from this lady. What is surprising is that the alert mother of the girl did not suspect the publican much sooner. Mrs. Marsh confided her suspicions to her husband, and together they took a practical step. Marsh put the case before his own doctor, a Dr. Grapel, of Croydon, and as a result Dr. Grapel went to the Crown to consult with Dr. Stoker, much apparently to the surprise and resentment of Chapman.

It was, therefore, with the definite object of looking for symptoms which might suggest that the illness of Maud Marsh was not a natural one that Dr. Grapel went to the Crown. Consequently, in a very short time, he concluded that the patient was being slowly poisoned. What was the agent that was being employed by the poisoner? That was a more difficult question for the doctor. But, pondering deeply over the case on his return journey to Croydon, he arrived home with the fixed opinion that the poison was arsenic. Realising that immediate action was necessary if Maud Marsh's life was to be saved, Dr. Grapel at once telegraphed to Dr. Stoker, telling him to look for that poison. Unfortunately it was too late to save the life of the unhappy patient. Chapman, evidently taking fright at what he considered the dangerous visit of Dr. Grapel, administered a much stronger dose to his victim, and thus brought about her very sudden end. Dr. Stoker, because of Dr. Grapel's message, refused to grant a death certificate. It has been left on record that Chapman was very much surprised and annoyed at this, and that he angrily questioned the somewhat uncertain doctor about it. But Dr. Stoker more than held his own, as the following interesting colloquy will show: "Why?" asked Chapman, after the certificate had been refused. "I cannot find what is the cause of death," replied Dr. Stoker. "It was exhaustion," said Chapman, "caused by inflammation of the bowels." "What caused the inflammation?" asked the doctor. "Continual vomiting and diarrhœa," answered Chapman. "What caused the vomiting and diarrhœa?" persisted the doctor. There was no reply.

Shortly after Maud Marsh's death, another very remarkable incident occurred: Dr. Stoker conducted a private post-mortem examination without previously notifying the coroner. Obtaining permission from the old vestry-hall to remove the body, he caused it to be taken, strangely enough without objection from Chapman, to the mortuary where, assisted by Drs. Cotter, French, and Poycott, he made a partial examination of the remains. The examination revealed nothing to account for the sudden death of the woman. Dr. Stoker then removed the stomach and other organs, placed them in bottles specially prepared for their reception, and, taking them to the Chemical Research Association, Borough High Street, requested an analyst named Richard Bodmer to look for arsenic. On the following evening the Association reported to Dr. Stoker that arsenic had been found in the remains. Dr. Stoker at once wrote to the coroner, Dr. Waldo, and also informed the police.

Regarding this private and partial post-mortem, Dr. Waldo has sent me the following observations:—"I lunched with the judge in the case at the Old Bailey (Grantham), and he agreed with me that the post-mortem carried out by the medical attendant on Maud Marsh might have ended in the contents, &c., of the stomach being lost, as was actually the case in the Palmer poisoning case, when the last victim (Cook) was dosed with antimony and finished off with strychnine."

I think Dr. Waldo is wrong about the Palmer case. Palmer tried by various cunning means to destroy the remains which were being put aside for analysis, but, as the sequel proved, he did not succeed.

Chapman was arrested on the morning of Saturday, 25th October, 1902, the day on which the Coronation Procession of King Edward VII. passed through the streets of London. After his removal to the police station in the Borough his premises were thoroughly searched. Included among many interesting things which the police found and took possession of were some white powders, many documents, and nearly £300 in gold and notes. The officers, of course, discovered from the papers that their prisoner was Severin Klosowski, a Russian Pole. That night Klosowski, *alias* Chapman, was charged with the murder of Maud Marsh.

IV. The Magisterial and Coroner's Inquiries.

Maud Marsh was buried at Croydon. Although it was an exceptionally wet day, many people gathered to watch the passing of the funeral procession. This interest was, perhaps, partly occasioned by an incident in connection with a wreath which had been sent by the prisoner, who, by the way, paid the expenses of the funeral. This wreath was an elaborate affair, being made up of lilies, tuberoses, camellias, and pink chrysanthemums, tied with violet ribbon. A printed card was attached bearing the words "In Memorium," and in writing below "From a devoted friend, G. C." The initials had been appended by the prisoner himself, while he stood in the dock at the police court. With regard to this wreath, somebody—possibly the father of Maud Marsh—had written to the newspapers protesting against a wreath being accepted from Chapman, and threatening that if one were sent it would not reach the grave. A scene was, therefore, anticipated; but the sightseers were disappointed. No one disturbed Chapman's wreath, which was the only one upon the coffin when it was lowered into the grave, the others remaining, as is usual, outside. In this way, of course, the wreath became hidden, which was probably the object intended.

Following the partial post-mortem held by Dr. Stoker, a more thorough examination was made by the coroner, Dr. Waldo, in the presence of Dr. Thomas Stevenson, the Home Office expert. The mortuary was situated in a thoroughfare known as Collier's Rents, Long Acre, Bermondsey, a stone's-throw from St. George's Church. A great deal of care was taken with this examination, Dr. Stevenson supervising everything that was done by his assistants. Certain portions of the body, including a part of the spinal column, were placed in vessels prepared for their reception, securely sealed, and deposited in a large box, which was tightly corded. This box was taken in a cab to Guy's Hospital. The subsequent analysis occupied several days, after which Dr. Stevenson announced that the poison which had caused Maud Marsh's death was not arsenic, but antimony.

Dr. Waldo opened the coroner's inquest on the Tuesday

following the arrest of Chapman. At this time the mission hall in Collier's Rents was used as a coroner's court. For the brief hearing the prisoner was not present, but was represented by his solicitor, Mr. H. I. Sydney; only one witness, Mr. Marsh, was called, and the inquiry was then adjourned. On the previous day the police court proceedings had been opened at the Southwark Police Court, before the late Mr. Paul Taylor. Most, if not all, of the succeeding hearings were held before Mr. Cecil Chapman. As in the case of the coroner's inquest, the first day's court proceedings were brief. One witness, Inspector Godley, was called, and the officer gave formal evidence of arrest, after which the case was adjourned for a week. Mr. Sydney applied for bail, emphasising that the evidence was so far very slight, and pointing out that the prisoner was a licence-holder. The application was opposed by Inspector Godley, who contended that there was nothing to prevent the prisoner from taking to flight. That he had no banking account, and invariably kept a good deal of cash on his premises, was evidence that Chapman was always prepared to disappear suddenly. The magistrate refused bail, and the prisoner was remanded in custody.

Among the articles found by the police at the Crown, which had a bearing on the case, were some medical books treating of poisons, and, strangely enough, a book written by Berry giving details of his career as a hangman. A paragraph describing this particular find appeared in the newspapers, and was noticed by Berry, who wrote a letter to Inspector Godley about it. He appealed to the police to keep all reference to his book out of the case, explaining that he wished to be entirely dissociated from it. He had, he said, destroyed all the copies remaining in his possession, and all others which he could find. Although he gave no reason for his eager desire for the total obliteration of his own creative work, it is possible that he may have sought to forget entirely his grim professional experiences. At any rate, he was not disturbed, for in the evidence the police made no reference to the book.

Thus, these two independent inquiries—the magisterial and the coroner's—into this tragedy were progressing on

parallel lines. It is of more than passing interest to recall this, because there has been recently placed upon the Statute Book an Act which will make it highly improbable, if not impossible, for such a thing to happen again. The Coroners (Amendment) Act, 1926, is framed with a view considerably to curtail or circumscribe the future activities of the coroner in cases of this kind. This much-needed reform has been long on the way, but that it has come at last is evidence of the steady and sure advance of social improvement. It is appropriate and interesting to quote the following words of Dr. Waldo on this particular part of the case:—"I went into—as fully as I could with what evidence was available—the Chapman case. Dr. Stevenson was prevented from giving evidence before me until he had been before the magistrate and Mr. Bodkin for the Crown, although the police from Scotland Yard had agreed to produce him before me when wanted by me. Mr. Bodkin apparently did not like my having so full an inquiry—which was in Chapman's interest—and criticised me in the magistrate's court, which was reported in *The Times*. His feeling was then, as now, against the coroner and jury having a full inquiry into cases charged before a magistrate or bench of J.P.s."

It is well known that the present Director of Public Prosecutions, Sir Archibald Bodkin, is a strong opponent of the premature holding of coroner's inquests in murder cases; he is of opinion that they seriously impede the police in carrying out their difficult duties, and are detrimental to the true interests of law and justice and public security. There are people who go further than this, and contend that even the magisterial inquiry should also be cut down, if not entirely abolished, and that there should be no public hearing of the case until it finally reaches the ultimate tribunal of the Sessions or the Assizes, as is the procedure in Scotland. On account of the far-reaching nature of their effects, these reforms must, however, be most carefully considered before anything material is done.

Dr. Waldo continues: "In the coroner's court no solicitor or barrister has any right to examine or cross-examine save by the courtesy of the coroner. Neither has

any one a right to address the coroner's jury save the coroner himself. Prominent counsel—especially in non-fatal but suspicious fires held alone by me in the city—sometimes try to address the jury. I have, however, never allowed this, and always, as the representative of the public, have the last say. As a barrister, I allow lawyers to examine witnesses under my ruling. I think the new Coroners Act, clipping the wings of the coroner in cases in which there is a charge of crime by the police, will be against the interests of the prisoner, especially before a legal coroner, as in London and in other big cities." The words of an experienced coroner like Dr. Waldo must necessarily carry weight; but it will, of course, take some considerable time to prove whether or not the Coroners Act has justified its existence.

When the case first came before the police court it was suggested that, as it was necessary to exhume the bodies of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor, probably several adjournments would be necessary. This proved to be correct; the exhumations were made and the adjournments were innumerable. This case is, in fact, unique in that it holds the record for the number of appearances made by the prisoner at the police court, before finally he was committed for trial. And during all this time the police were fully occupied building up a most formidable indictment.

The exhumations occurred respectively at Leyton and at Lynn, in Cheshire. The former was that of Mrs. Spink, whose body was found in such a remarkable state of preservation as to surprise Dr. Stevenson, who was not at that time familiar with the action of antimony on the human body. The body of Bessie Taylor was equally well preserved, and was easily identified by a relative of the woman.

At the police court the case was not without its humorous moments. The hairdresser's traveller, Wolff Levisohn, when he caught sight of Chapman in the dock, became very excited. "There he sits!" he exclaimed, "That is his description. He has not altered from the day he came to England; he has not even a grey hair. Always the same—same la-di-da, 'igh 'at and umbrella. Two wives he had while at Tottenham—one English, one foreign." These observations brought a wild protest from Chapman's solicitor,

Mr. Sydney, who remarked, "You seem to have a lot of feeling in this matter." "Not at all," went on Levisohn, "Why, bless your heart, the moment I see the name Chapman I knew this is the man, but I don't want to push myself forward, so I wait till the police come to me."

Chapman was put up several times for identification, and was immediately picked out each time—by his first wife, Lucy, and her sister, Stanislas Rauch, and also by the Hastings chemist, Mr. Davidson.

Important evidence was given by a woman named Florence Raynor, whose appearance in the witness-box caused the prisoner to look up (his normal position was with his face cast down) and gaze intently at her. She lived at Peckham, and had been in service near the Crown, into which she occasionally went during the lunch hour. Thus she became friendly with Maud Marsh. She told the "Chapmans" that she had previously been a barmaid. As a result, Chapman asked her if she would come in and attend to the bar while he and his wife went out for the day. She did so, later accepting a situation at the Crown as barmaid at 5s. a week, with board and lodging. Chapman intended to get possession of yet another woman, for he soon made overtures to her, and often kissed her. When he asked her to go to America with him, she reminded him that he already had a wife. Chapman thereupon remarked: "Oh, I could give her that"—snapping his fingers—"and she wouldn't be no more Mrs. Chapman." It was soon after this that Maud Marsh's second and last illness began. Shortly before Miss Raynor left the Crown Chapman pressed her to be his "sweetheart," but, fortunately for the girl, she refused. Subsequently she obtained a situation as barmaid at the Foresters' Tavern, at Peckham, where Chapman visited her.

There was at this same time another formidable criminal in the hands of the police, a man named Edgar Edwards, who had murdered an entire family at Camberwell. It has been left on record that Chapman, having heard of his redoubtable fellow-criminal, one day remarked to a warder, "Edwards is a hot 'un!" Interesting praise, of which Edwards, had he lived, might justifiably have been proud.

George Chapman was finally committed for trial at the Central Criminal Court on 11th February, 1903.

V. The Trial.

(a) Judge and Counsel.

Mr. Justice Grantham, who presided over the trial, was in 1903 one of the most popular judges in England. He was an enthusiastic sportsman, and, probably as a result of this, was inclined to be less conventional on the bench than is usual. Although he was a profound lawyer, Grantham had shortcomings which were sometimes made very apparent in cases coming before him. For instance, he often arrived at a preconceived notion of a prisoner's guilt, and made no attempt to conceal it from the jury. Again, he had an annoying habit of persistently interrupting counsel. As an illustration of this, what was known as the "Uncle Joe Case"— a prosecution for perjury—suggests itself. This case was heard at the Old Bailey, only a short time after the trial of Chapman. A private inquiry agent was charged with fabricating evidence in the Divorce Court, whereby a divorce was granted to the petitioner, with £1500 damages against the co-respondent—the "Uncle Joe," whose name was Joseph Worsley. Mr. Robson, K.C., and Mr. Guy Stephenson (now Sir Guy Stephenson, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions) appeared for the defence. On account of the constantly recurring attacks upon him by Mr. Justice Grantham, who accused him of raising false issues, Mr. Robson found it impossible to continue to conduct the defence, which he left entirely to his junior, Mr. Stephenson. The latter pluckily continued with the case, but he could scarcely utter a dozen words without an interruption from the bench. He was told that he was talking rubbish, that he must not travel outside the case, that he must not put certain questions, and so on. Mr. Stephenson would from time to time look hopelessly at the judge, drop his brief, sit down, get up again and try once more, only to be subjected to further interruption. And so the case proceeded, a most remarkable series of incidents. When, finally, the accused entered the witness-box, the judge practically became a prosecuting counsel, examining the witness himself. Mr. Stephenson protested: "With great respect, my lord, may I be allowed to examine the witness in my own way?" only to be met with the reply: "With all

respect, Mr. Stephenson, I am judge here, and I am to see that justice is done, and when the witness says something startling I think it is my duty as judge to give the witness an opportunity of explaining it."

Mr. Justice Grantham was endowed with a pleasant resonant voice which, when he spoke, carried to the furthest corners of the Court. He was also of pleasing appearance, having a clean-cut scholarly face.

Sir Edward Carson, Solicitor-General, (now Lord Carson), led for the prosecution. As he has made very few appearances in Criminal Courts, there is consequently little to be said here about him. At one time very much in the public eye, both in legal and political circles, he has long since retired into private life.[1] The most remarkable case in which he ever appeared at the Old Bailey was that which marked the downfall of that ill-fated literary genius, the late Oscar Wilde. The duel between those two Irishmen, the one in the witness-box and the other in the well of the Court, will never be forgotten by any one who was fortunate enough to be present: Wilde, heavy, fleshy, large-eyed and thick-lipped; Carson, slim and eager, with flushed face, tense and determined, slowly extracting damaging admissions from the reluctant accused.

With the Solicitor-General was the late Sir Charles Mathews, then Mr. Charles Mathews, at that time the acknowledged leader of the criminal bar. Sir Charles subsequently became Director of Public Prosecutions, being the immediate predecessor of Sir Archibald Bodkin in that office. He was a small, spare man, with a keen, alert face and an incisive manner. Being a prodigiously hard worker, his face was pallid and at times careworn. He was not a popular man, and as Director he was never favourably viewed by Scotland Yard; his methods were not liked, and he was inclined to be too interfering. Sir Charles has often been accused of adopting dramatic methods in his advocacy; but this was, perhaps, mainly due to the nature of the cases in which he was called upon to appear. His thoroughness, at any rate, could never be doubted. He was always in the most deadly earnest, having a masterly grasp of his case, which he had beforehand assiduously digested in chambers. In Court he

[1] He still sits in the Privy Council.

seldom required to refer to his brief, for he knew by heart all the points which he desired to make, and where and when he wished to make them. He had a peculiar voice, thin and high pitched when he raised it, but very impressive when he lowered it. His most deadly points against an accused he made almost in a whisper, or in leaving to the imagination something to which he had very carefully led up. In emphasising an important point he also became very acrid. His career extended over a long period, and at the time of this trial he had appeared in more famous criminal cases than any of his colleagues.

Mr. (now Sir) Archibald Bodkin, who opened the case for the Crown in the police court, was also a familiar figure at the Old Bailey. He is tall, broad-shouldered, rugged of countenance, and commanding of aspect. He has large grey eyes, which are capable of expressing a wonderful depth of retrospection, as though he were looking back over many years and recalling within himself some of the many strange cases with which he has from time to time been associated. He has a keen sense of humour, but he seldom laughs aloud; his clean-shaven face merely becomes alive with an expression of appreciation. He speaks in a clear, full voice, and every word he utters, one instinctively realises, has been carefully thought out beforehand; for he never seems to arrive at a hasty conclusion. Like his predecessor, he is a very hard worker, but, unlike Mathews, he has achieved some popularity with the police chiefs at Scotland Yard.

The defence was entrusted to the late Mr. George Elliott, K.C. Mr. Elliott was a short, stubby little man with rosy cheeks. He had studied with Sir Edward Clarke, for whom he had much admiration. Possessed of a clear, precise delivery, he had a homely irrepressible sense of humour, which sometimes encroached upon his emotional moments, the transition from one to the other being so sudden. Occasionally he would endeavour, though not always successfully, to encourage appreciation by smiling contemplatively at his own witticisms. He almost invariably appeared for the defence, and during his career had defended many "great" criminals, including Dougal, of the Moat Farm, Devereux, the trunk murderer, Rayner, who shot Mr. Whiteley, and Lody, the German spy.

With Mr. Elliott was the late Mr. Arthur Hutton, who was also associated with Mr. Elliott in the Devereux case. A tall man, who always wore a monocle, Mr. Hutton seemed the very antithesis of the old, bullying Old Bailey serjeant. He seemed incapable of losing his temper or of getting excited. In his slow, persuasive speech, he relied more upon logical argument than forceful rhetoric. Like Mr. Elliott, his methods were well adapted for defence, and he made a good foil to the trenchant, insistent, bitter, and emphatic style of Sir Charles Mathews, against whom he so often appeared. Mr. Hutton excelled in addressing a jury, with whom he made himself very ingratiating, taking them into his confidence in a sympathetic and genial manner. Jurymen, like most people, are susceptible to flattery, and Hutton understood how to appeal to that weakness. Sometimes, in spite of the most obvious evidence of guilt, by his eloquent persuasion he would almost succeed in convincing a jury that his client could not possibly be guilty, the very idea being made to sound preposterous. At the Old Bailey Mr. Hutton defended many bloodthirsty ruffians, the most notable of whom were probably Milsom and Fowler, of the Muswell Hill case.

(b) The Proceedings.

The trial of George Chapman was held in the old Central Criminal Court, which, with the adjacent prison of Newgate, has long since disappeared, the new Central Criminal Court now standing in its place. As those who know only the present Old Bailey can scarcely imagine what the old Courts were like, some description of them should be here furnished.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the old Court No. 1, where this trial took place, was not unlike a large cellar or basement apartment. A meagre light was borrowed from a large reflector, which was suspended outside the only exterior window, similar to what is employed outside city basement offices. In consequence, artificial light was used for the greater part of the year. There was a mean little entrance about half-way down the Old Bailey, giving access on the left to an aged, wooden staircase, which twisted and turned up to the first floor,

where the Court was situated. Although on the first floor, it was surrounded by strong high walls. The entrance to Court No. 1 for witnesses and others having business there was from a side passage; this place was always full of shadows, and at no time knew the full light of day. To get to the entrances at the top of the Court, where the "City Lands" seats were situated, one mounted another short flight of stairs, and turned into a larger and lighter corridor. There was also a door at the back of the judge's seat, which was covered with a heavy crimson curtain. If the Court were entered from the side—from the gloomy corridor—the jury-box was on the left, the dock on the right, and the witness-box facing, between the jury-box and the bench. The small public gallery was situated immediately above the dock. The front occupants of it could, by leaning over, look down upon the heads of the occupants of the dock. There was a large clock, with an aged, discoloured dial, beneath the gallery. Immediately above the well of the Court there was a small wooden box, something like a church pew, in which a rugged-faced reporter, sitting with bowed head, wrote, to all appearances, endlessly.

The old Courts seemed much more appropriate places for the holding of criminal trials than those of the present time. No. 1 Court, in particular, was most gloomy and depressing. On the occasion of an important trial, like that of George Chapman, it was usually most inconveniently crowded, the atmosphere of the place being anything but conducive to longevity. The approaches and adjuncts to the Courts were, if anything, even gloomier than the Courts themselves. There was a stone-paved passage connecting the cells with the Courts, which was cheerfully called "Dead Man's Walk," or sometimes "Birdcage Walk." This flagged passage was the Newgate burial-ground; it was enclosed in high, grimy walls, and had a roof of open rusty ironwork, not unlike a grille. The graves were under the flagstones, so that in the event of a prisoner being convicted of murder and sentenced to be hanged at Newgate, he walked over what was to be his own grave! This grim clearing-house also boasted of two condemned cells, a scaffold, a "black-hole," which was formerly used for the reception of refractory prisoners, and a chapel, in which condemned men heard their last sermon.

This, then, was the Old Bailey when George Chapman came up for trial. His case aroused considerable public interest, having, of course, received in the press a great deal more than the generous amount of space that is devoted to even the very ordinary murder case. People flocked to the first day's hearing in much the same way as they do to the theatre on the occasion of the first showing of a notable production. But most of them were to be disappointed; tickets of admission had been issued in advance to privileged persons, so that every vacant place in the public gallery was taken up. Yet a large crowd, assembling in a courtyard of the Old Bailey, waited all day in the vain hope of getting into Court.

Inside of Court No. 1 there were certain preliminary features which suggested a forthcoming theatrical performance rather than a trial for murder. Mr. Under-Sheriff Langton, in full court dress, with sword at hip, was showing distinguished visitors to their seats; in the gallery were many women, who made free use of lorgnettes and opera glasses; and there were people who had brought refreshments with them in order that they might not have to leave, and so lose their seats. The judge entered the Court about eleven o'clock. Immediately afterwards the prisoner appeared, surrounded by warders, up a trapdoor in the dock. It was noticed at once that his appearance had undergone a great change. The indifferent, cynical attitude that he had shown throughout the police court proceedings was gone; his self-assurance seemed to have entirely deserted him, leaving him pale and nervous. Looking about him in an apprehensive manner, he was considerably embarrassed when he found all eyes fixed on himself. When asked to plead by the Clerk of Arraigns, he made no reply. Being asked a second time, he answered in a very low voice, as if he had already given up all hope. Then he sat down and employed himself in perfunctory note-taking. Counsel for the prosecution opened the case, and contented himself by merely stating the facts in cold, unimpassioned words.

In almost every trial for murder there exists until the end of the proceedings a strong element of doubt as to the ultimate issue; but from the beginning of Chapman's case there did not appear to be any shadow of doubt as to how it would eventually end. The trial seemed to be only a matter of

taking the evidence, and then of receiving the inevitable verdict.

Before making his speech Mr. Elliott had, in a room adjoining the Court, conferred with the accused and one of the doctors in the case, presumably for the purpose of obtaining something upon which to found his plea. Obviously, Elliott knew how utterly futile his case was. Yet, with practically no single point with which to counter the powerful case for the Crown, and upon which to base an argument, he made a valiant effort on behalf of his client. He laid considerable emphasis on the fact that Chapman was an alien, arguing that he therefore stood prejudiced in the minds of the jury before any evidence was heard. The alien question, it should be pointed out, was at this time acute. From the first Mr. Elliott knew that his defence could not possibly succeed; every one present, with the single exception of Chapman, who wept, listened unmoved to his speech; and one felt that Chapman's tears were of much the same kind as he had been wont to shed after slaughtering his victims. Both prosecuting counsel and judge later observed that the alien question had nothing to do with the case—it mattered not of what nationality the accused happened to be—and would in no way interfere with the due and impartial administration of the law.

In his summing up Mr. Justice Grantham remarked that this case was unique both from chemical and from medical points of view. This was certainly correct, for it surprised an accomplished toxicologist in Dr. (afterwards Sir) Thomas Stevenson. As has already been noted, Dr. Stevenson had not then had much experience of the action of antimony on the human body, and he was astonished, though not, we may suppose, displeased, to find the exhumed bodies in such a good state of preservation. It was indeed a singular thing that the poison used by Chapman to destroy the lives of his "wives" should also preserve their bodies so completely that the results of their examination, produced at the trial, rendered material assistance in bringing about the murderer's own well-merited end.

However extraordinary this case already was, from a legal standpoint it was made still more remarkable by the judge's summing up. Seldom, if ever, has there been delivered a

charge quite like that of Mr. Justice Grantham. While it is recognised that a judge should speak impartially, one can understand that his own convictions may cause him to lean very slightly to one side or the other. But the tone, the manner, and the matter of Justice Grantham's summing up resolved themselves into a lengthy comment on a verdict already delivered. That there was anything in the nature of a consequent miscarriage of justice is not implied; but the judge was clearly so influenced by the obvious guilt of the accused that his speech became almost a continuation of counsel's speech for the prosecution. Perhaps, however, this was inevitable, as Chapman had been able to make practically no answer at all to the Crown case.

The jury retired, and were out of Court for only eleven minutes. After hearing the verdict the accused, when appealed to in the usual way, made no response; terror seemed to have rendered him speechless. Then followed the sentence in scathing terms. After which Chapman was driven away through the inevitable crowd of very morbid people who, hissing, showed clearly that they were still disinclined to sympathise with him; he was, in fact, until his death, a universally detested criminal.

VI. Secret Poisoning.

About the conduct of the medical men who attended Chapman's victims Mr. Justice Grantham spoke in his summing up in terms far removed from flattery. He did not, however, alone confine his remarks to the omissions of these unhappy gentlemen; he afterwards embarked on a severe censure of the entire profession. This reproof was occasioned by the invariable failure of doctors to detect, and incidentally to frustrate, the operations of the secret poisoner. These observations have suggested the inclusion of the present chapter in this volume.

It should be understood that, in what he believes to be a poisoning case, a doctor usually finds himself in a position of very great delicacy; in a position where he can render practically no assistance to his patient until he boldly accuses some one of attempting to murder; which, of course, no

man will do unless he is possessed of the unlimited courage of his convictions. As the Solicitor-General said in one of his speeches for the prosecution, "It is a most serious thing for a doctor to throw suspicion upon a household." Even when a doctor becomes suspicious, when he is assured in his own mind that his patient is being poisoned, what can he do? In the absence of certain knowledge of a person's guilt, in whom can he confide his private opinion? If, acting under a mere suspicion that he entertains, he accuses some one, and his accusation proves ill-founded, the consequences for him will be most serious. Of course, it is open to him to order his patient to hospital, thus removing him from the would-be murderer's attentions; but the patient may refuse to go, or his relatives may, unwittingly, obstruct the measure. At the same time even if he does go, a hospital can, as in Maud Marsh's case, afford only temporary immunity from the assaults upon his life.[1]

In view of the many difficulties encountered by doctors in such cases, Mr. Justice Grantham's words may at first seem unreasonable; but there is no doubt that he was making due allowance for them. What he deplored was the strange, consistent failure of the practitioner to discern, even in the presence of the most convincing evidence, the symptoms of poisoning and his consequent inability to discover the poisoner. And, indeed, in few poisoning *causes célèbres* have the mediums of discovery been medical men, Dr. Hincks in the Armstrong case, and Drs. Julius and Bird in the Richmond mystery, being, of course, notable exceptions; while these two cases are given, they can be set off by a dozen or more instances in which poisoners have been exposed by the sagacity of vigilant laymen. The present case provides an admirable example. Here, after Dr. Rogers had diagnosed Mrs. Spink's death as due to phthisis, after Dr. Stoker had attributed Bessie Taylor's death to the natural result of prolonged vomiting and diarrhœa, only the suspicions of Mrs. Marsh obviated a like error in her daughter's case.

In earlier times—in the days of, for example, the successful poisoner, Catherine Wilson, this lack of medical observa-

[1] The position of the doctor in such cases is fully dealt with in the "Trial of Dr. Pritchard," edited by William Roughead.—Ed.

tion can be better understood. At the time of this sinister woman's terrible career, the knowledge of many poisons, which are not now in any sense obscure, was not comprehensive. Now, however, all the symptoms of poisoning by vegetable and mineral agents are so well and so exactly known that they cannot, it would seem, be confused with those of natural attacks of illness. There are the infallible tests of Marsh, Reinsch, and others, and there is the practical knowledge derived from a wide variety of cases to guide the modern practitioner. Therefore, if the protest be made that present-day poisoners have applied a degree of science to their crimes to which earlier criminals never attained, it may be replied that the counter-application of science to the detection of poisoning has in comparison been very much greater. With all this advancement, however, still one other important circumstance remains to be accomplished before the poisoning murder-rate will be appreciably reduced; that is, in the words of a prominent Home Office official, for doctors to "think of poison." To a layman this must certainly appear rather as requiring a process of common-sense deduction than any amazing achievement of medical skill. Surely when there are present all the known symptoms of poisoning by arsenic or by strychnine, and the illness has mysteriously failed to submit to appropriate remedies, the correct inference should not be hard to draw. But in practice the medical omissions that cases have disclosed seem to point differently.

It will be remembered that it was at first thought that arsenical poisoning caused the death of Maud Marsh, minute traces of that mineral being found in her body at the first post-mortem examination; but subsequently Dr. Stevenson found antimony. Two things accounted for the mistake made by Drs. Grapel and Stoker: first, the symptoms of arsenical poisoning being similar to those produced by antimony; and, second, the discovery of the negligible quantity of arsenic, which had been introduced into the woman's body as an impurity in the antimony. Both of these poisons are irritants, but antimony is the greater depressant. The irritant nature of the latter is illustrated by the fact that if a little of the poison be applied

Bessie Taylor and George Chapman.

(From a Photograph taken by Chapman.)

to the skin, a pustular rash will appear. Antimony, being colourless, odourless, practically tasteless, and easily soluble in water, is a very dangerous poison from a homicidal point of view. It is, as the name indicates, an emetic, and it is curious that, if given in a large dose, it is likely to be expelled, proving entirely innocuous. That is why the poisoner is careful to administer it in comparatively small doses, as was, in fact, done by Chapman.

Antimony, like phosphorus and arsenic, tends to produce fatty degeneration of the heart. The symptoms, both ante and post-mortem, are those of gastro-enteritis, and as such antimonial poisoning has occasionally been diagnosed. What forms a fatal dose is difficult to decide, because it varies according to the constitution of the person to whom it is administered. Thus, as little as one and a half grains has killed; while, on the other hand, a person has been known to recover from a dose of 400 grains.[1] The first case, however, was most exceptional, and in the second the process of ejection must have accounted for the non-fatal result. When antimony is administered, its action will be hastened or retarded according to whether food has, or has not, been taken immediately before the dose. To resist the poison, the stomach-pump may be used to wash out the stomach. It is also considered appropriate to administer tea, the tannin in the tea acting on the antimony as a counter-irritant.

Here is the result of the analysis in the case of Maud Marsh—

				Grains.
Stomach contained	tartarated	antimony	weighing	0.64
Intestines	,,	,,	,,	16.64
Liver	,,	,,	,,	1.98
Kidneys	,,	,,	,,	0.39
Brain	,,	,,	,,	0.47
				20.12

In Bessie Taylor's case it was—

				Grains.
Stomach contained	tartarated	antimony,	weighing	0.32
Intestines	,,	,,	,,	23.43
Liver	,,	,,	,,	4.55
Kidneys	,,	,,	,,	0.82
				29.12

[1] Glaister's "Medical Jurisprudence."

And in the case of Mary Isabella Spink—

				Grains.
Stomach	contained	tartarated antimony,	weighing	0.08
Intestines	,,	,,	,,	1.15
Liver	,,	,,	,,	2.42
Kidneys	,,	,,	,,	0.18
				3.83

That Mrs. Spink's body had been in the ground for several years is probably the reason why so little antimony was here discovered. The other two bodies were, to use counsel's words in the case of Maud Marsh, truly "soaked in antimony."

Antimony has in the past been held in high favour by homicidal doctors; it was the poison used by Dr. Pritchard and it also figured in the case of Dr. Smethurst. Until recent times its properties were not generally known, and were even unfamiliar to many medical practitioners. So that, where it might have been folly to employ arsenic or strychnine, the poisoner could with some assurance administer antimony, and—as it almost proved in Chapman's case—sometimes with complete safety. Chapman gained a slight knowledge of the properties of this poison while serving with the surgeons in Poland, and afterwards made a much closer study of it.

As has already been mentioned, the medical and chemical professions are now familiar with all the vegetable and mineral poisons usually employed by poisoners. Unfortunately it seems that at no very distant date this serviceable knowledge may no longer answer its purpose, for the poisoner of the future, according to Sir James Crichton-Browne, the eminent authority on toxicology, will avoid the employment of such familiar and scheduled agents; he will, instead, have recourse to the germs of various diseases. It is known at present that these germs can be and are cultivated, and it is possible to administer them to a person without arousing any suspicion, either before or after death. And they may be developed to such a degree of malignity as to be capable of creating a virulent and inevitably fatal attack of any specific disease, as the following case will show.

In the year 1909, a Colonel Swope, a multi-millionaire living in Independence, a town ten miles from Kansas City,

U.S.A., died suddenly, and soon afterwards the remaining members of his family began to die from typhoid fever. Suspicions were aroused by the excessive mortality in Colonel Swope's family, and a doctor and a lawyer began an investigation. They found that the water used in the house was not infected with typhoid germs, and there was no source of the disease upon the property, and that the infection must have been brought in from elsewhere. A doctor called Hyde had married one of Swope's nieces—the Colonel had no children of his own and his property was all left to his sister-in-law and her six or seven children. The will contained the following provision:—If any of the heirs died, his or her share was to be divided equally among the surviving heirs. Thus, if all died but one, the remaining heir would inherit all. Colonel Swope's body was exhumed, and found to contain strychnine, and the deaths of the rest of the family were felt to be fully explained when it was found that Dr. Hyde had obtained typhoid germs from a bacteriologist and culture in which to grow them. Hyde was tried and found guilty, and sentenced to life imprisonment, though he was released after seven years of that curious and persistent litigation which the rich are able to indulge in the United States of America. That he had deliberately killed off several members of the Swope family by inoculating them with typhoid germs, so that his wife should eventually inherit the millions, there was no doubt.

One can well imagine how very difficult detection is where a murder is perpetrated in such subtle disguise; but although one or two of these cases have already been brought to light, there is no need yet for alarm. At present, such poisons can only be procured or created by a scientist, and can only be utilised by him; they are entirely beyond the access of the ordinary layman, who has not the expert knowledge of the scientist. Nothing, however, can be ventured as to what may happen in the future, when the higher education of the public has advanced a few stages further. It is interesting to note that Sir James Crichton-Browne has been reproached for making facts like these known. He has replied that it is not dangerous to put people on their guard. There is, he says, more chance of trouble being caused if knowledge of these facts be concealed. And certainly knowledge, pro-

vided it is authoritative, comprehensive, and wisely applied, is power. One has only to study these cases of secret poisoning to realise this. In the absence of knowledge, where often it might reasonably have been expected to exist, many lives have been sacrificed.

VII. The Mentality of Chapman.

That Chapman was sane in the narrow sense of the legal definition of sanity; that being capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, he realised the enormity of his behaviour and what its legal consequences would be, there can be no shadow of doubt. Like almost all famous murderers, he was exceptionally clever at one moment and a hopeless blunderer at the next. He was, above all, a most remarkable example of the over-confident criminal. The many extraordinary blunders which he made during his criminal career can only be attributed to excessive self-conceit. He must have applied himself to his grim tasks assured that, having so skilfully laid his plans, and his intelligence being so superior to that of the police, exposure was hardly possible. His imprudence was, of course, much increased by a long immunity from detection. It has been proved many times that multiple murderers become more daring and reckless with each successful crime, until at length they fail to observe even very ordinary precautions.

It would be interesting to discover when the idea of murder for gross personal gratification first germinated in the brain of this unscrupulous Polish adventurer. Probably it occurred to him when he commenced to acquire knowledge of the power that lies dormant in the various poisons to which his medical duties in Zvolen gave him access. It is possible that he may have committed murder before he left Poland; his good-conduct certificates, which he seems to have collected fervently, certainly do not prove otherwise. They do not truthfully indicate the trend of his innate character. It will be recalled that Samuel Herbert Dougal, the Moat Farm murderer, had first-class discharges and testimonials.[2] Chapman collected formal documents of little more importance

[2] "Trial of Samuel Herbert Dougal," edited by F. Tennyson Jesse.

than ordinary references, which it is notorious may readily be procured and which are often of a spurious nature. Doubtless, however, he was assiduous in his studies and duties, and was well-behaved so far as his mentors knew.

Consistent mendacity was one of Chapman's main characteristics; he never spoke the truth when a lie offered and served as well. After his arrest, in idiotic attempts to help his case, he told many trivial lies. For example, on one occasion he stated to police officers that he had been a student at Jesus Hospital, Warsaw. This was given a line in the newspapers, and brought a letter from a correspondent at Cambridge, whose brother was a house physician at that hospital. At his brother's request, the doctor had made a search of the hospital records, but had failed to trace a student named Klosowski. It was quite certain that he had never been there.

Being an accomplished liar, he was also, as so often follows, a braggart. He delighted to talk about his wonderful adventures on the seas, although his knowledge of them was probably very limited, and his experiences quite ordinary. He wished to be thought a keen sportsman, often boasting to his customers about his big-game exploits. These stories were without foundation, unless, of course, his jungle was the cellar beneath the Crown and his game the rats, which, trapped therein, he was accustomed to shoot with a revolver. Going in extensively for photography, he photographed the women whom he afterwards murdered. He was also—like Dougal—an enthusiastic cyclist. While in England, Chapman made strenuous efforts to obscure his true nationality. In addition to adopting an English name, he always represented himself as an American, and in support of this he invariably displayed the American flag in his public-houses. At the time of the South African War (it had just finished when he was arrested) he made himself very objectionable with his pro-Boer sympathies, rejoicing over our reverses and drinking success to the Boers. Adventurer and sportsman though he may have been, it would appear from this that he was not, at any rate, a first-class business man.

Reference has already been made to the finding of a copy of Berry the hangman's book in Chapman's premises. Appreciating to the full that what he was doing was contrary

to law and justice, he showed a morbid kind of interest in everything pertaining to the criminal law. He was always careful to cultivate the good opinions of the police, and, while licensee of the Prince of Wales, it was his custom to cycle with members of the local police cycling club on their outings. At that time he was the author of at least one murder—that of Mrs. Spink. The subsequent revelation of this must have made the policemen wonder at the novelty of their own experience.

As has been noted, Chapman was brought to his trial and ultimately condemned, because of his own foolish mistakes. When one looks at his errors of judgment and lapses from discretion, it seems incredible that a man engaged in such perilous enterprises could be so deliberately foolhardy. This man considered it most important that his true identity should be obscured; yet he carefully preserved papers containing irrefutable proof of his birth, origin, name, former occupation, his knowledge of drugs, and so on. It is impossible to understand his desire to retain all kinds of documents, which he must have known could be used against himself. Having openly bought poison at Hastings, he very carefully kept a label which recorded the purchase. The police search of his premises was certainly most productive. Chapman's true identity was obtained from his references, evidence of his purchase of poison was furnished by the surviving label, and the two previous deaths of the women, Bessie Taylor and Mrs. Spink, were disclosed by the discovery of undertakers' accounts and memorial cards! Has ever a criminal been quite as helpful to the police as this man was?

Again, Chapman's statements about his toxicological accomplishments were utterly unwise. It was injudicious to observe to Florence Raynor that he could easily get rid of Maud Marsh by giving her a pinch of "that." Still more imprudent was it to raise suspicions in the minds of Maud Marsh's relatives by mysterious threats. When a sister of Maud Marsh (of whom, by the way, he also tried to get possession) commented on the fact that not even the doctor could say what was really the matter with her sister, Chapman, snapping his fingers, remarked, "Bah! the doctors!

I could give her that and none of them would ever know!" Criminal history, like other history, repeats itself; this was in effect the observation of that famous poisoner Marie Jeanneret, repeated in less direct language forty years later. The girl, not understanding the implication of these incriminating words, repeated them to her vigilant mother. Chapman had, at last, made his fatal mistake; this ill-judged statement marked the beginning of his march to the gallows.

It seems to be the case that murderers of women possess a mysterious, powerful influence over the minds of their victims. It was so with Smith[3] (the bath murderer), the notorious Landru, Crossman (the trunk murderer), and many others. These criminals succeeded in obtaining victims with the utmost facility, as also did Chapman in the case under review. The women seem to have raised no objection to taking part in a bogus marriage ceremony, or, rather, an imaginary marriage ceremony, in order to hoodwink their own relatives and friends. If they had been deceived by him as to the true nature of the ceremony—there is ample evidence to prove that they were not—then a reasonable explanation might be given, marriage being a natural aspiration with most women. This man, however, did not offer them marriage, but something very ignominious in its stead, and in each case they readily acceded to his odious proposals.

A masterly dissembler, ingratiating and heroically flattering, Chapman gave liberally—particularly in presents of jewellery—to women whom he was pursuing—(this was not generosity, for he knew that anything he gave would eventually revert to him). Thus it is possible that a woman might have been imposed upon, but only, of course, temporarily so; for as soon as his primitive desires were satisfied, Chapman became indifferent, taking no trouble to make the woman believe that he still had any affection for her. More than this, except in the presence of the woman's friends, and until her fatal illness began, Chapman treated her brutally. Yet none made the slightest attempt to leave him, which each was at liberty to do. It follows that these women must have found something tremendously attractive in the personality of Chapman, although that captivating

[3] "Trial of George Joseph Smith," edited by Eric R. Watson.

characteristic was certainly not apparent to men. And it is certain that, had the manner of Maud Marsh's death passed uninvestigated, Chapman would have experienced little difficulty in procuring other victims.

Of the three cases, Bessie Taylor's surrender to the lustful publican was by far the most surprising. She was a superior woman of pleasing appearance who had held good situations in London, and whose going to work at all was not apparently of necessity, but rather of her own choosing. Why did she yield to Chapman, who was socially far below her, illiterate, and of repulsive appearance? Did she at first become interested in the man because he was so obviously of a nationality different from her own? For, although he was masquerading under an English name, it must have been evident to Bessie Taylor that Chapman was of Continental origin; though he never revealed this to her, it was depicted in his face and exhibited in his speech, manner, and habits. But why, when she discovered Chapman's true character after only a few weeks of life together, did she continue to live with him? It would be absurd and entirely futile to attempt here an explanation of this solitary case when so many other mysteries of the same kind have never been explained. Why, for example, did Miss Camille C. Holland, of refined tastes and independent means, become the mistress of a sensual, coarse, and penniless ruffian like Samuel Herbert Dougal?[4] And why did so many comely and respectable women walk blindly into the shambles of that modern Bluebeard, Henri Landru?

VIII. Perjury and Arson.

The police had in the time preceding the trial built up a very powerful case against Chapman, and, while they were fairly confident of success, failure to prove the case was not regarded as entirely impossible. On the other hand, the officers, never too confident, had prepared for such a thing by holding in readiness two other charges—those of perjury and arson—against their prisoner. The story of how these charges arose is interesting.

[4] "Trial of Samuel Herbert Dougal," edited by F. Tennyson Jesse.

Introduction.

In June, 1902, only a few months before his arrest, Chapman appeared as prosecutor in a case heard at the Newington Sessions. A man named Alfred Clark, described as a commercial traveller, and a married woman named Matilda Gilmor, or Oxenford, of Brixton, were charged with conspiring to obtain £700 from him. Clark, who was a well-known criminal with a long record, had become acquainted with Gilmor while she was in domestic service somewhere in the country. Doubtless acting under the influence of Clark, Gilmor stole from her mistress some share certificates in the Caledonian Gold Mining Company, Limited, and left her employment hurriedly.

Clark took the woman with him to London, where they endeavoured to raise money on the stolen shares, which, however, proved to be practically worthless. Spending much of their time in public-houses, they approached publicans in different parts of London, and had already tried and failed at the Flowers of the Forest, Blackfriars Road, when they put the "investment" before the licensee of the Crown. The woman had previously become known to Chapman as a customer. The result of this offer was disastrous for the two. Chapman declared to the authorities that he had paid £700 on the security of some of the certificates. He explained that he had specially exchanged gold for notes at the Bank of England, and had handed them to the prisoners; adding that the money had been paid in two separate amounts on two different days. He was asked to give the numbers of the notes and he did so, the police, of course, taking careful note of these numbers. Chapman called his "wife" to corroborate his story, which Maud Marsh did.

Chapman was severely cross-examined by the defending counsel, who threw doubt upon his statement that he had paid £700 in cash, and still had money enough in hand to carry on his business. He was asked why he had no bank account and why he kept his money in a drawer, to which any one might have access, and he replied that he did not believe in banks. Eventually, the jury, supposing the woman to have been the tool of the man, acquitted her; Clark was found guilty, and sentenced to three years' penal servitude and two years' police supervision.

Within a few months of this trial one of the witnesses was dead, murdered by poison, and the prosecutor was in custody charged with the crime.

After the arrest of Chapman, Inspector Godley, while searching the prisoner's premises, found in an upstairs drawer notes and gold of value nearly £300. At the first hearing of Chapman's case at the police court, the prisoner's solicitor asked that this money should be given up by the police. Inspector Godley made no objection to returning the gold, but he asked to be allowed to retain the notes a little longer. He had strong suspicions about some of these notes—the numbers striking him as being familiar—and he retained them to make further inquiries. The inspector's suspicions were well founded; his search established that several of the notes bore the same numbers as some of those that Chapman had sworn he had paid to the man Clark! It was evident, therefore, that an innocent man had been sent to penal servitude, and steps were at once taken to secure his early release. Home Office instructions were conveyed to the governor of Portland Prison, where Clark then was, and on 29th December, 1902, he was liberated. His certificate of release was worded as follows:—"Portland Prison.—I have this day discharged Alfred Clark absolutely and unconditionally from His Majesty's Prison.—(Signed) J. E. Broome, Governor. Conduct—Good."

No doubt Clark's record helped to convict him. It was practically a bogus prosecution, although Chapman did actually pay £7 to the woman, which she stated—probably truthfully—was a loan. But why did he make £700 of it? What was his object, it may be asked, in making such a dastardly charge and in so seriously perjuring himself? Perhaps his motive was to get rid of the man, in order that he might have free access to the woman, with whom he was flirting at the time.

A remarkable feature of this case was the fact that the late Arthur Hutton, K.C., appeared in it to prosecute on behalf of Chapman, whom he subsequently assisted to defend at the Old Bailey.

The charge of arson arose from another incident in his much-varied criminal career, and related to the manner of his departure from the Monument Tavern. Early one

morning, at a time when the lease of this house was nearing expiry, the place was found deserted, with a fire in the basement well alight. The doors were open, the tills had been cleared, and nearly all the furniture had been removed. The Fire Brigade from nearby headquarters only overcame the outbreak with difficulty, and the property suffered serious damage. The occurrence was reported in the morning's papers, and as a result Chapman had the temerity to issue a writ for libel against the proprietors of the *Morning Advertiser*. But afterwards, when he was confronted with certain facts produced by the police and the insurance officials, he recognised the advisability of withdrawing this; he was nevertheless bold enough to make a claim on the insurance company, which they resisted. In the end he got nothing, and the company cancelled his policy. There can be no doubt whatever that he deliberately set fire to the Monument. This was a very obvious case of arson, and it is surprising that no action was then taken by the police in the matter. But that Chapman had practically no difficulty in obtaining a lease of the Crown only shortly afterwards is still more astonishing.

IX. The Aftermath.

After conviction Chapman was removed to Wandsworth Prison. It was perhaps appropriate that he should occupy in that prison the cell which Edgar Edwards, his "great" contemporary, for whom he once had a word of praise, had vacated only shortly before. The Court of Criminal Appeal had yet to be established, so that all that remained to be done on Chapman's behalf was for his solicitor to forward the usual appeal to the Home Secretary. As was expected, the Home Secretary did nothing. Chapman had been a moody and restless prisoner, and, after this decision, required careful watching. It was thought that he might attempt to commit suicide. When he was asked if he wished to see any of his friends, Chapman replied in bitter tones, "I have none!" This was not true, for the Polish woman who was believed to be his legal wife called repeatedly at the prison, but he persistently refused to see her; the only person whom he would see from outside was a Roman Catholic priest. Pro-

testing his innocence to the very end, he maintained that he was not Severin Klosowski, but George Chapman, an American citizen. In the face of such overwhelming evidence to the contrary, this seems to have been a last effort to stave off the execution, similar in a way to that of Dr. Lamson,[5] who obtained a temporary respite from death by declaring that evidence of his innocence was to be found in some affidavits which were on their way from America.

While in prison, Chapman wrote several letters: of their style the extracts printed below are typical:—

> Believe me, be careful in your life of dangers of other enimis whom are unnow to you. As you see on your own expirence in my case how I was unjustly criticised and falsly Represented. Also you can see I am not Believed. Therefore you see where there is Justice.
>
> They can take my life, but they cannot kil my soul and take it from me. God is my Judge and I Pray to have Mercy on my soul, for my sins which I have dun durin my Life.
>
> But as to crime I am innocent and I have clear conscious of it.
>
> I pray God for sinners who are suffering unjustly in this country. Believe me i am werry grievously sorry but it could not be help now. . . .
>
> Shall be now starting preparing for my Deth as it is past four o'clock afternoon.

And again,

> One thing whod I wish is this to be Remembered as I am an American orphend of good family and I left my foster father, against his wish, and I took to erning my own living at age of ten.
>
> And since that time I worked the best I could get, and although I never been so unlucky since I lost that poor Bessie Taylor and therefore I regretted that day ever since I have stopped in this country.

Chapman's literary efforts are surely worthy of Charles Peace himself! He also made a will by which he left property to the value of £140 to the relatives of Bessie Taylor. He had not yet quite forgiven Mr. and Mrs. Marsh; by his instructions only a ring and certain clothes were to be given to them.

For his final protest against the fairness of his sentence he used the old stock device of the defeated criminal, charging those who had given evidence against him with having committed perjury and the police with having falsified evidence.

---

[5] "Trial of Dr. Lamson," edited by H. L. Adam.

Hardly original, and, of course, futile. Chapman was executed at Wandsworth on 7th April, 1903.

X. Chapman and Jack-the-Ripper.

After the investigations had been completed and the case against Chapman was fully established, the police authorities entertained a strong idea that some sinister connection existed between the Borough poisoner and the mysterious murderer of Whitechapel, popularly known as Jack-the-Ripper. Circumstantial evidence to support this belief was not lacking. The matter is, therefore, of sufficient interest for notice here. It is proposed to present a very brief account of the series of murders attributed to the unknown criminal, and afterwards to show how the circumstances surrounding them are coincident with the career of Chapman.

The first murder of this series took place in the early morning of 31st August, 1888, the victim being Mary Ann Nicholls, who lived in a common lodging-house in Thrawl Street, Spitalfields, and who was of the unfortunate class. Her body was found in Buck's Row, Whitechapel, about 4.15 a.m. The throat was cut from ear to ear and the lower part of the body was shockingly mutilated. At the subsequent inquest some interesting, though not very helpful, evidence was given. A police surgeon, who examined the body while it lay in Buck's Row, stated that the deceased was lying flat upon her back; he estimated that she had died about half an hour before his arrival there; and on account of the direction of the cuts, he believed that they had been inflicted by a left-handed man. It appeared that the murder, carried out as it was with a very sharp knife, had been swift and instantly effective. As no sound was heard by any one in the surrounding houses, the victim had died without uttering a cry. The coroner's jury brought in the inevitable verdict of "Wilful murder against some person or persons unknown."

The second murder, occurring on the following 8th September, was that of a woman named Annie Chapman, who also was an "unfortunate." Her body, with injuries similar to, and even more revolting than, those of Nicholls, was found in Hanbury Street, which is quite a short distance

from Buck's Row. As before, no weapon was found, and there was no clue left by the murderer. A man did come forward to state that, while he was walking through Hanbury Street at 5.25 a.m. on the morning of the murder, he overheard some persons talking on the other side of some palings near the spot where the body was afterwards found; he remembered that, as he passed, one of them said "No." This information was, of course, of no value whatever to the police. With their actions based upon no foundations, they detained several well-known criminals; but each suspect was able to satisfy his interrogators about his movements on the morning of the tragedy. Many wild stories were circulated about a mysterious gentleman known as "Leather Apron." This man was found, and the police were quickly convinced that he knew nothing about the murder. To offer a reward of £100 for information that might lead to the arrest of the murderer was the next step of Sir Charles Warren, the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police. This produced nothing, other than clues which led to loose ends.

It has been mentioned that the injuries in the second case were of a particularly horrible character. On an examination being made it was discovered that some of the internal organs of the dead woman were missing. Many conjectures were made at the inquest as to the kind of weapon used by the assailant. The coroner suggested that it might have been a soldier's bayonet, or slaughterer's knife, or a post-mortem knife wielded by a medical man, or one used in the leather trade. While the surgeon admitted that it might have been any one of them, that did not help the investigations much.

For three weeks after the second crime the lives of the prostitutes of Whitechapel went undisturbed. Then, on the morning of 30th September, came the master stroke of this savage. About one o'clock the body of Elizabeth Stride, yet another of their number, was found in Berners Street, against the wall of the International Workmen's Club. The woman's throat was cut, but her body had not been injured. Firmly clasped in one hand she held a bunch of grapes and in the other some sweetmeats. Rain had fallen, and the woman's clothes were saturated. Her

body was removed to the mortuary of St. George's-in-the-East.

That same night Jack-the-Ripper murdered Catherine Eddowes, another prostitute, in Mitre Square, Aldgate, hardly more than ten minutes' walk from Berners Street. Eddowes, like her wretched fellow-victim, had been living in Flower-and-Dean Street, a most notorious thoroughfare at that time. The circumstances surrounding the second murder illustrated vividly how swiftly the murderer worked and how extraordinarily elusive he was. At 1.30 a.m. a police constable, walking round the square, noticed nothing unusual. Fifteen minutes later, at 1.45, a man found the body, with the throat cut and trunk mutilated, in the south-west corner of the square. As it happened that the police were that morning closely watching people entering the square in twos, it was surmised that the murderer and Eddowes entered separately and met inside. Apparently the Berners Street murder had been committed shortly before one o'clock, and, being interrupted, the murderer had been obliged to leave his victim's body without inflicting the usual abdominal injuries. Disappointed and annoyed, perhaps, at having thus been frustrated, the murderer looked about for a second victim. He found her, and here, at any rate, he was able to complete his ghastly task.

This double attack by the Whitechapel murderer created widespread panic in the neighbourhood of the crimes and sent a shock throughout the entire city. The police, both City and Metropolitan, were alarmed and dismayed. Rewards totalling about £1000 were offered for the capture of the fiend, with the result that many private persons set themselves out to catch him. About this time a letter and a card, both purporting to come from the murderer, were received by the police. The letter was as follows:—

> Sep. 25 Dear Boss,—I keep on hearing the police have caught me but they won't fix me just yet. I have laughed when they look so clever and talk about being on the *right* track. The joke about Leather Apron gave me real fits. I am down on whores, and I shan't quit ripping them till I do get buckled. Grand work, the last job was. I gave the lady no time to squeal. How can they catch me now? I love my work and want to start again. You will soon hear of me and my funny little games. I saved some of the proper red stuff in a ginger-beer bottle over the last job, to write with, but it went thick like glue, and I

> can't use it. Red ink is fit enough. I hope. Ha! Ha! The next job I do I shall clip the lady's ears off, and send to the police officers, just for jolly, wouldn't you? Keep this letter back till I do a bit more work, then give it out straight. My knife's so nice and sharp, I want to get to work right away if I get a chance. Good luck—Yours truly, JACK-THE-RIPPER. Don't mind me giving the trade name. Wasn't good enough to post this before I got all the red ink off my hands; curse it. No luck yet. They say I am a doctor now. Ha! Ha!

The card bore the postmark "London, E., Oct. 1," and read—

> I was not codding, dear old Boss, when I gave you the tip. You'll hear about Saucy Jack's work to-morrow. Double event this time. Number one squealed a bit; couldn't finish straight off. Had not time to get ears for police. Thanks for keeping last letter back till I got to work again.—JACK-THE-RIPPER.

The police attached sufficient importance to these documents to send copies to the leading newspapers for reproduction. It was thought that the handwriting might form a clue, but nothing came of it. Had it not been for certain features in them, they might well have been regarded as the compositions of a practical joker endowed with a most horrible sense of humour. The dates were suggestive, and in the case of the last victim an attempt had been made to cut off an ear.

The terror that reigned for a time in the city had decreased considerably before the next outrage was perpetrated. On the following 9th November, the body of Mary Jane Kelly was found in a house in Miller Court, Dorset Street, Spitalfields. Her body was the most shockingly mutilated of the entire series of atrocities. A prominent doctor, much experienced in dissecting-room work, was shocked, and stated that in his whole career he had never seen anything so horrible. The discoverer of the body was a man sent by Kelly's landlord to collect arrears of rent, who, on finding the door of Kelly's room locked, forced an entry. On the eve of her murder some one in the house heard Kelly singing. She must have gone out later, met with her murderer, and returned to Miller Court. Indoors the Ripper was given a more favourable opportunity than he had yet had to carry out his work. In connection with this crime the police interviewed a man who had been living with Kelly, but he was, of course, able to account satisfactorily for his movements.

Plan of Murder in Whitechapel.

Immediately after this murder the following notice was issued by the police:—

> MURDER—PARDON. Whereas on November 8 or 9 in Miller Court, Dorset Street, Spitalfields, Mary Jane Kelly was murdered by some person or persons unknown, the Secretary of State will advise the grant of Her Majesty's pardon to any accomplice not being a person who contrived or actually committed the murder who shall give such information and evidence as shall lead to the discovery and conviction of the person or persons who committed the murder.—(Signed) CHARLES WARREN, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, Metropolitan Police Officer, 4 Whitehall, November 10, 1888.

A man who knew the deceased then came forward to describe a man with whom he had seen her on the early morning of the 9th. Here is his description of the man: "Respectable appearance; height, 5 feet 6 inches, and age between 34 and 35; wearing dark coat with astrachan trimmings, black necktie, horse-shoe pin, dark gaiters, light buttons on boots, and massive gold watch chain."

The police persevered in their detention of suspected persons, but with no success. The wanted criminal continued to evade the authorities.

In his official capacity of wholesale murderer nothing more was heard of the Whitechapel murderer until July, 1889. Reports in the newspapers concerning him were, however, constantly appearing; among those the most interesting was one graphically describing his capture at Tunis. At a moment when people in London were beginning to think that they had heard the last of him, he made his presence known again in the East End with startling effectiveness.

In the early morning of 18th July, 1889, an unknown woman was murdered in Castle Alley, Whitechapel, her injuries being similar to those sustained by earlier victims. At 12.15 a.m., on the morning of the murder, a police constable had entered the alley and had partaken of a frugal supper under a lamp. At 12.25 a.m. he left the alley to speak to another constable who was engaged on the same beat. Returning at 12.50 he found the body of a woman, under the lamp where he had previously stood. The ground beneath the body was quite dry, though the clothing of the woman was wet. A shower of rain had fallen at 12.40: the murder was therefore committed between 12.25, when the constable left the alley, and 12.40, when the rain com-

menced to fall. An interesting deduction, but unfortunately it yielded no practical result.

This was the last murder of the series. The police were baffled, the Ripper finally and completely victorious. According to Sir Henry Smith, Commissioner of City Police at the time, the nearest they ever got to the murderer was on the night of the double murder. After the Mitre Square murder it was discovered that part of the woman's apron was missing; this was found, deeply blood-stained, outside the door of one of the Peabody Buildings in Goveston Street. Chalked on the wall above were these words: "The Jewes are the men what won't be blamed for nothing." This writing was immediately wiped off the wall by order of Sir Charles Warren, who feared a demonstration against the Jews. This was perhaps a mistake, as the handwriting might have afforded a clue. It was clearly established that the assassin had wiped his hands on the piece of apron, and, with characteristic audacity, had washed them at a sink situated in a close in Dorset Street, only a few yards from where his victim lay.

As every one knows, who this mysterious criminal was has never been cleared up. Several prominent officials have from time to time asserted that they had established his identity. The late Sir Melville Macnaghten, the late Sir Robert Anderson, Sir Henry Smith, and many others of less importance have assured us regarding this. Sir Melville Macnaghten even went so far as to declare that he had once possessed documentary proof of the identity of the criminal, but that he had burnt the papers. An unprecedented thing, surely, for a police official to do! These declarations, as mere declarations without evidence to support them, are unsatisfactory. It is quite certain that nobody ever did know for certain who Jack-the-Ripper was.

It is now proposed to present the case for supposing—one cannot put it in stronger terms—that George Chapman, or Severin Klosowski, was actually Jack-the-Ripper. For convenience, the facts are arranged in parallel columns.

JACK-THE-RIPPER.	CHAPMAN.
First murder of the series committed, in August, 1888.	Chapman arrived in London some time in 1888; worked and lived in Whitechapel.

JACK-THE-RIPPER—*Contd.*	CHAPMAN—*Contd.*
Other murders committed during 1888.	During this time Chapman was within easy reach of the scenes of these murders.
It was thought that Jack-the-Ripper had medical knowledge.	Chapman had been a medical student.
Description given of the man seen with the woman Kelly: "Height, 5 ft. 6 in.; age, 34 or 35; dark complexion, with moustache curled at ends."	This is a most faithful description of Chapman.
The Americanisms in the letter and card written to the police.	Chapman passed himself off as an American and used Americanisms in conversation.
The grim and callous joking tone of the messages.	Chapman was very callous, and was in the habit of indulging in pleasantries of this sort.
Last murder in London, July, 1889.	Chapman still in the vicinity.
No Ripper murders in England, but similar murders in America, in the locality of Jersey City.	Chapman and his wife left in May, 1890, for America, where Chapman opened a barber's shop at Jersey City.
At the beginning of 1892 Ripper murders cease in America.	Chapman left America and returned to London in May, 1892.

It is evident that before he committed his last murder Jack-the-Ripper realised that the game was becoming too hazardous; this is borne out by the fact that considerable time elapsed between the commission of his later murders, and his last crime was obviously perpetrated indoors to afford him greater security. If Chapman was actually Jack-the-Ripper, poisoning, as a much safer means of killing, might easily have suggested itself to him. Having changed

his method, it became, of course, imperative that he should seek an entirely different class of victim,

Chief Inspector Abberline, who had charge of the investigations into the East End murders, thought that Chapman and Jack-the-Ripper were one and the same person. He closely questioned the Polish woman, Lucy Baderski, about Chapman's nightly habits at the time of the murders. She said that he was often out until three or four o'clock in the morning, but she could throw little light upon these absences. Both Inspector Abberline and Inspector Godley spent years in investigating the "Ripper" murders. Abberline never wavered in his firm conviction that Chapman and Jack-the-Ripper were one and the same person. When Godley arrested Chapman Abberline said to his confrere "You've got Jack-the-Ripper at last!"

That Chapman's career coincides exactly with the movements and operations of Jack-the-Ripper must appeal strongly to all who endeavour to throw light upon the shadows of the latter's obscurity. The whole of Chapman's life cannot be made quite clear. At his trial the prosecution proved that he murdered Mrs. Spink, Bessie Taylor, and Maud Marsh; but as they made no effort to discover others no one can say, with confidence, how many murders he committed. A reasonable case for supposing that Chapman was Jack-the-Ripper has, at least, been furnished. At that the subject must be left, without material proof of the connection. Upon that strange period of Chapman's career, when he worked and lodged in Whitechapel, no new light can be shed, and the identity of Jack-the-Ripper will for ever remain a mystery.

Leading Dates in the Chapman (Klosowski) Case.

1865, Dec. 14.	Severin Klosowski born in Poland.
1880.	Apprenticed to a surgeon.
1886.	Klosowski employed as assistant surgeon in Praga hospital and afterwards enlists in the Russian Army.
1888-89.	Klosowski works as a hairdresser's assistant in Whitechapel under the name of "Ludwig" Klosowski.
	Jack the Ripper murders in London.
	Klosowski marries Lucy Baderski and shortly after goes to Jersey City in America.
	Last of the Jack the Ripper murders in July.
1890.	Murders similar to those of Jack the Ripper in America.
1891.	Klosowski's wife returns from America.
1892.	Klosowski returns to London. The Jack the Ripper murders in America cease.
1893.	Klosowski meets Annie Chapman, with whom he cohabits for about a year. Assumes the name of George Chapman.
1895.	Chapman meets Mrs. Spink at Leytonstone, and in October declares that they are married.
1897.	Balance of Mrs. Spink's money paid over to a legal firm representing "Mr. and Mrs. Chapman."
	Chapman carries on a hairdresser's business at Hastings.
,, Apl. 3.	Buys tartar-emetic from a chemist.
,, Dec. 25.	Death of Mrs. Spink.
1898-1900.	"Marries" Bessie Taylor.
	Leaves London and takes "The Grapes" public-house at Bishops Stortford.
1901, Feb. 13.	Death of Bessie Taylor.
,, Aug.	Engages Maud Marsh as a barmaid.
	"Marries" Maud Marsh.
1902, Oct. 22.	Maud Marsh dies.
,, 25.	Chapman arrested.
,, 28.	Opening of Coroner's Inquest on the body of Maud Marsh.
1903, Feb. 11.	Chapman committed for trial at Central Criminal Court.
,, Mar. 16.	The Trial.
,, Apl. 7.	Chapman executed.

THE TRIAL

WITHIN THE

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT,

Old Bailey, London,

MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1903.

Judge—

MR. JUSTICE GRANTHAM.

Counsel for the Crown—

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir Edward Carson, K.C., M.P.),

Mr. H. SUTTON,

Mr. CHARLES MATHEWS, and

Mr. A. H. BODKIN.

(Instructed by Mr. Sims on behalf of the Treasury.)

Counsel for the Accused—

Mr. GEORGE ELLIOTT,

Mr. ARTHUR HUTTON, and

Mr. VYVYAN LYONS.

(Instructed by Mr. Thomas Sydney.)

THE TRIAL.

First Day—Monday, 16th March, 1903.

Severin Klosowski (thirty-six), alias George Chapman, was indicted for, and charged on the coroner's inquisition with, the wilful murder of Maud Eliza Marsh.

After the arrest of the accused on the above charge he was subsequently accused of the murder of Mary Isabella Spink and Elizabeth (Bessie) Taylor by the same method, namely, antimonial poisoning.

Mr. Elliott submitted that the prosecution were not entitled to prove the deaths of any other women at previous dates, which were alleged to have been brought about by the accused, as he was separately indicted for them. He referred to *Reg.* v. *Winslow*, 8 Cox's Criminal Cases, and *Reg.* v. *Oddy*, before the Privy Council in 1893, and *Reg.* v. *Makin*, App.Cas. 1894.

The Solicitor-General submitted that he was entitled to open the facts and give evidence of the death of other women with whom the accused had lived, and submitted that the case of *Winslow* had been everruled. He quoted *Reg.* v. *Gill*, 18 L.J., M.C. 66, and *Reg.* v. *Flemington*, 15 Cox, 403, and also the case of *Neill Cream*.

Mr. Justice Grantham ruled that the evidence was clearly admissible.

The accused was then called upon to plead to the three indictments, to each of which he replied, in a low voice, "Not guilty, sir."

The jury were then charged to try the case for the murder of Maud Marsh.

Speech for the Prosecution.

The Solicitor-General (Sir Edward Carson, K.C.), in opening his address, said—The accused and Maud Marsh had been living together as husband and wife at the Crown, High

Street, Borough. Maud Marsh died on 22nd October under circumstances and with symptoms which induced the doctor who attended her to refuse to give a certificate of death, and the result of the post-mortem examination went to show that the body of the deceased woman was literally saturated with antimony. I think it will hardly be disputed that Maud Marsh died from poisoning. No doubt a large dose was administered shortly before death, and there was every indication that she had been repeatedly dosed with it for some time before death. The real question you have to try is whether it was administered to her by the accused.

Perhaps it will assist you in the elucidation of the history of the case if I say a few words with regard to antimony. Antimony itself is a metal. It is a most irritant poison when reduced to a chemical condition. It is the main ingredient in a powder called tartar-emetic, or emetic-tartar, and is a white powder easily soluble in water. It is clear when dissolved, and is easily introduced into foods, liquids, or other medicines. One extraordinary effect of the poison is that, if it is administered during the lifetime of the person, it preserves the body in a remarkable degree, so that even several years after death the body of the deceased person is easily recognisable. The poison causes constant vomiting and very often great purging spasms, occasionally emaciation, and it causes the person to whom it is administered to have a most anxious look. There is also frequent intense irritation of the throat.

The accused is a Russian Pole, and his name is Severin Klosowski.

Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—Was he originally charged in the dual name?

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL—He was charged at first, my lord, as George Chapman, but the accused's correct name came out during the inquiry. It is important to bear in mind the fact that in his early days in Russia he studied medicine. He appears to have had considerable experience as a barber-surgeon—a profession not now known in this country. He came to this country about 1888, and worked as a barber in various places. In October, 1889, he married a woman named Lucy Baderski, who is still alive. At one time they

went to America, and she appeared to have come back without him. In 1895 the accused purchased a house in High Road, Tottenham, still using the name of Klosowski. At that time he had left his wife, and he appeared to have met a young woman named Chapman, and it is probable that this induced him to take the name of George Chapman, by which name he has gone up to the present time. In 1897 he purchased a barber's shop at Hastings, and there made the acquaintance of a married woman named Spink, with whom he subsequently lived, they passing as Mr. and Mrs. Chapman.

While at Hastings we find the accused buying an ounce of tartar-emetic on 3rd April, 1897, which contained 146 grains at least of antimony, from Mr. Davidson, a chemist, whose book containing the entries of the sale of poison, with the accused's signature to it, will be produced. Two grains of tartar-emetic have been known to be fatal, and 10 or 12 grains would undoubtedly be so. A curious example of the preservation of evidence is the fact that among the accused's property there has been found the label placed by the chemist upon the packet* containing the tartar-emetic, and bearing the words, "Dose, one-sixth to one-quarter grain. To be used with caution." Subsequently, in 1897, the accused and Mrs. Spink removed to the Prince of Wales beerhouse, Finsbury, where the woman was taken ill, and subsequently died on 25th December.

At Easter, 1898, the accused took into his employ at the same house a girl named Bessie Taylor, the daughter of a Cheshire farmer. They appear to have gone through some form of marriage, and in March, 1899, they removed to the Monument public-house, Union Street, Borough, where on 13th February, 1901, Bessie Taylor died.

After the death of Bessie Taylor the accused made the acquaintance of Maud Marsh, a young woman eighteen or nineteen years of age, whose parents resided at Croydon. Her parents were anxious as to the place their daughter was going to, and the accused told them two deliberate lies—that he was a widower, and that there was a family living in the house. In consequence, however, of the accused's statements, Maud Marsh went to live at the Monument tavern.

* Should be "bottle."

The Solicitor-General

On 13th October accused and Marsh stated that they had been married, and thenceforth they were known as Mr. and Mrs. Chapman. In 1902 they removed to the Crown public-house, the Monument having been burned down—about which you will hear a great deal in the course of the inquiry. It was supposed by Maud's relations that she was at this time married to the accused, who, in June, 1902, made the acquaintance of a girl named Rayner, and asked her to go to America with him. She refused, saying, "You have got a wife downstairs," to which he replied, "Oh, I could give her *that* and she would be no more Mrs. Chapman!" It was this date which synchronised with the commencement of the illness of Maud Marsh, which ultimately terminated in her death in October last.

During the course of her illness Maud Marsh was taken into a hospital, and speedily recovered, but her illness returned after she went back to the accused, who, once referring to her illness, said, "I could give her a bit like this and fifty doctors would not find out." The accused also told her sister that she was dying fast. Maud Marsh continued to get worse in spite of all that was done for her, and after her death Dr. Stoker refused to certify as to the cause of death. An important witness in the case is Jessie Toon, who was engaged to nurse Maud Marsh. After Maud's death she had an important conversation with accused, who told her to be careful and watch the deceased girl's mother, whom he described as an old cat who was desirous of showing him up. Other statements were made by the accused, and it will also be proved that he frequently administered doses of brandy to the deceased girl, who vomited very much after taking it. Her mother on one occasion, and the witness Toon on another occasion, drank some of the brandy left by the girl, and both were seized with vomiting and purging.

When Dr. Stoker refused a certificate of death the accused asked why, and proceeded to say that the death was due to exhaustion. "But what," inquired Dr. Stoker, "caused the exhaustion?" The accused answered "Vomiting," and Dr. Stoker then inquired, "What caused the vomiting?" Afterwards the accused suggested that death was due to arsenic, which might have been present in some rabbit which

the inmates of the Crown, including the girl, had partaken of on the previous Sunday. As a result of the post-mortem examination, 20.12 grains of antimony were discovered in the body of the deceased, and, when I tell you that 2 grains have been known to kill a person, you will see that, as I said earlier in my speech, the body of Maud Marsh must have been literally saturated with antimony. A bottle has been discovered which had been rinsed out, and which contained a medicine prescribed by Dr. Stoker for the girl, and it was found to contain antimony. Dr. Stoker will tell us that he never prescribed antimony, and that he has not had any such chemical in his surgery for the last ten years.

I submit that upon this evidence there can be no doubt that Maud Marsh died from antimony poisoning. Only three or four persons could have administered the poison, and as to two or three of them it is impossible that they could have done so. It was the accused who alone was in very close contact with the girl, and who took upon himself to introduce into the room the only food and drink she received, and it was the accused who in 1897 purchased, as I have said, a very large quantity of the very poison which this woman had taken. It is to this man that the evidence all points—a man whose early training made him acquainted with drugs and poisons. It is in this direction only that the evidence points, and I submit that the accused's was the master hand, and that it was the accused's previous experience which led him to believe that he could safely run the risk of deceiving the doctors. There is no reasonable hypothesis which can lead you to come to any other conclusion.

[Upon the Solicitor-General referring to the similarity of the deaths in the cases of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor, Mr. Elliott, for the defence, submitted that the prosecution were bound by the facts connected with this one indictment only, and must limit themselves to this one matter. They could not introduce other facts for the purpose of prejudicing the case or for other purposes. He quoted decided cases in support of his contention, including the case of *Queen* v. *Winslow*.]

[The Solicitor-General said these decisions had not been acted upon, and even so recently as the case of *Neill Cream*,*

* "Trial of Neill Cream," edited by W. Teignmouth Shore.

The Solicitor-General

tried in this Court before Mr. Justice Hawkins, the course he proposed to follow was adopted.]

Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—The matter is really too clear for argument, and it could only be of any moment in the case of a negative defence.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL—If there had been any doubt I should not have pressed it.

In the case of Mrs. Spink, on exhumation the body was found to be in an exceedingly good state of preservation. Antimony to the extent of 3.83 grains was found in the body, and, changing the names of the doctor and nurse, I can only repeat verbatim the symptoms of Maud Marsh and apply them to the death of Mrs. Spink. It was the same regarding the death of Bessie Taylor. There was the same miserable story of torture and suffering during the last few weeks of the illness.

I desire to state the facts absolutely without feeling and with moderation, because we are engaged in the trial of a man against whom the verdict may mean the loss of his own life. These cases of poison, although rarer, are perhaps more important than other cases of murder which more frequently come before the Courts, because of the difficulty there is in tracing them out. But if a distinction can be made in degrees of murder, I submit that no murder can be more determined and more malicious than that by poison, such as the one we are now inquiring into. Certainly no murder could be more demonstrative of the cruelty of the person perpetrating it than that of a man standing by the bedside, day after day, of the person he professed to love, and seeing her suffering torture and gradually sinking away from what he had by his own hand administered under the pretence of treating that person for maladies with which he professed to be acquainted.

Evidence for the Prosecution.

WOLFF LEVISOHN, examined—I live at 135 Rosslyn Road, South Tottenham, and am a traveller in hairdressers' appliances. I have known the accused since 1888, when I met him in a hairdresser's shop in Whitechapel. I spoke

Wolff Levisohn

to him in Yiddish. He said he came from Warsaw. I knew him as Ludwig Zagowski. We met from time to time up to 1890. He told me that in Warsaw he had been practising in the medical line as a "feldscher" at the Praga Hospital. I have been a "feldscher" myself. I had seven years' training in the Russian Army. A "feldscher" is an assistant to a doctor. I talked to the accused about medicines, and he asked me if I could get him a certain medicine, but I said no, I did not want to get twelve years. I had a customer named Haddin at 5 West Green Road, South Tottenham. About 1894 or 1895 I called at Haddin's and saw the accused there. He was then an assistant, but he afterwards bought the shop which had once belonged to Mr. Haddin, in High Road, Tottenham. Later on he sold the shop and went away for several months, when he came back to a shop opposite Bruce Grove Railway Station. I called upon him there. I lost sight of him for a time, and I next saw him in custody. When a man becomes a "feldscher" in the Russian Army he gets a book given to him which contains his progress right through the service, and in civil hospitals he gets a certificate. The accused could not have been a soldier, because he was too young when he came over here.

Cross-examined—I have been in this country since 1862. In 1870 I was called home to do my military service, and I came back to this country again after I had completed my service. The accused never showed me any of his certificates as a "feldscher." I did not see him from 1895 till 1903.

Mrs. Ethel Radin, examined—I am the wife of Abraham Radin, of 82 Riveter Street, Shoreditch. About fifteen years ago, when we kept a hairdresser's shop in West India Dock Road, we had an assistant named Klosowski. I identify the accused as that man. He said he had been a "feldscher" in Warsaw. He had some papers with him, which he read to me, which were in the Russian and Polish languages. They had reference to his studies. He was with us for five months, during which time my baby was ill, and he helped me in the treatment of it.

Cross-examined—Before you identified the accused did a gentleman come to your place with a photograph?—Yes.

Mrs Ethel Radin

And did you then go and pick out the accused?—Yes. I am quite sure about him.

Re-examined—When you saw the photograph were you quite sure it was Klosowski?—Yes.

Stanislaus Baderski, examined—I reside at 406 Hoe Street, Walthamstow, and I am a tailor by trade. I come from Poland, and I have known the accused for thirteen years. I first met him in a Polish club in St. John's Square, Clerkenwell, in 1889. He was introduced to me as Severin Klosowski. He told me he had a barber's shop. I have two sisters, one of whom was named Lucy Baderski. She met the accused at the Polish club, and they kept company together for four or five weeks, after which they got married. I was not at the wedding, but I went to the party in the evening after it. The accused and my sister were present at the party. It was on August Bank Holiday, 1889. They lived together in Cable Street and then in Greenfield Street, and they were known as Mr. and Mrs. Klosowski. There was one child of the marriage, a son. My sister left the accused about eighteen months after their marriage. She is alive now. I last saw her two or three months ago at Southwark.

Cross-examined—The accused was not a member of the Polish club, but he came there every Sunday night. I went to his house once or twice after he married my sister, but I did not have much to do with him. I did not see him again after he left my sister until I saw him in custody. I saw his name in the papers.

Did the police come to you?—Yes.

And did they show you a photograph?—Yes.

Did you go to Southwark Police Court and identify the accused?—Yes.

And had you not already seen the photograph before you went to the Court?—No, I am quite sure I had not.

Mrs. Stanislaus Rauch, examined—I am the wife of William Rauch, of 292 Burdett Road, and I am the sister of the last witness. I have a sister named Lucy. I last saw her about four weeks ago. She left German Poland before I did. I only came over about three years ago, and at that time my sister was married. Her married name was

The Solicitor General (Sir Edward Carson, K.C., M.P.).

(Photo. by Russell.)

Mrs Stanislaus Rauch

icy Klosowski. I met her husband in a public-house in hitechapel Road. I think he is the accused. When I came to London my sister was living with him in Greenfield Street, and I used to go and see them there. When their first baby was born I saw the accused washing it just like a nurse. He said he had been a "feldscher" at the Hospital of the Infant Jesus at Praga, near Warsaw. I remember him and my sister going to America. She came back alone in February, 1891. Another child was born on 12th May. When the child was about a fortnight old the accused came back from America, and I then left my sister, as they were going to live together. I left them together in the same lodgings. That was the last I saw of him.

Cross-examined—Were you shown a photograph before you went to the Court?—Yes, by Mr. Godley. I had seen another one before I came to London thirteen years ago which had been sent to my father.

Had you seen the accused very often before he went to America?—Yes. I came over here in August, and they went to America about the following Whitsuntide.

When you went to pick the accused out were you quite sure of him?—I was not quite sure of him at first, but afterwards I was quite sure. There was no other man like him among them.

Re-examined—How many men were there present?—There were about twenty men altogether.

How many photographs did you see of the accused?—Two.

Alfred Wicken, examined—I am a hairdresser at 2 Market Terrace, Lea Bridge Road, Leyton. Some years ago I was employed by Mr. Haddin, who had a hairdresser's shop in West Green Road, Tottenham, and accused was also employed there. We used to call him "Schloski." He worked there for about nine or twelve months with me, after which he took a shop in High Road, Tottenham, which had formerly belonged to Mr. Haddin. I left the neighbourhood before the accused. I next saw him at Southwark Police Court a few months ago.

Cross-examined—Have you ever heard the accused called Ludwig Schloski or Severin Klosowski?—No. It was in

1892 or 1893 that I met him. I only know Levisohn. I did not know any of the others. I may have known Levisohn at the time I knew the accused. I did not know that Levisohn knew the accused as Ludwig Zagowski until after this case commenced. I never heard the accused called by any name except "Schloski."

Were you shown two photographs before you went into Court?—Yes.

When you identified the accused was he in the dock?—Yes.

Re-examined—I am an Englishman, and have no experience in the pronunciation of Russian names. I did not know how the man's name was spelt.

Mrs. Stanislaus Rauch (recalled), further examined—I identify the lady now shown to me in Court as my sister Lucy, who was living with the accused, and, I understand, was married to him.

William Lenion Bray, examined—I am managing clerk to Mr. Braund, solicitor, of 6 Gray's Inn Square, and I live at 82 Park Lane, Tottenham. I know a Mr. Pincott; he is a personal friend of mine. In 1895 he was the owner of the shop at 518 High Road, Tottenham. About December, 1894, I was consulted by him with reference to the letting of that shop. The man who proposed to take it came alone to see me on several occasions, and he gave his name as Severin Klosowski. After giving me some references, an agreement was drawn up, which he signed in my presence. On 14th January I was at Southwark Police Court when I saw several men, and I picked out the accused from amongst them as the man who had signed the agreement. I have no doubt about him. I remember a young woman coming to me on several occasions. I have no doubt she gave me her name, but I do not remember it now. It may have been "Annie Chapman."

Cross-examined—The accused called on me eight or nine times, and I afterwards collected his rent as it became due. That was eight years ago. I have not had much to do with people of his nationality.

George Godley, examined—I am a detective inspector. I arrested the accused at the Crown public-house. I found

a number of documents, amongst them being a book of prescriptions which I found in the box-room. On the front and back of that book is written "S. Klosowski." I also found a photograph and a number of documents in the Polish language in a drawer in the accused's bedroom. I found a diary for 1893 in which there appears the following entry: "Hairdresser wanted, indoors, 30s., to W. Holton, Clifton Baths Market." In the same book there are some newspaper cuttings pasted in, such as "Hair-brushing machinery, send for prices to the manufacturers, complete sets; easy payments arranged; new patterns." In the pocket of the book there is a sheet of notepaper on which is written: "Came from America in 1893, independent"; also, "Deposits £100, when from America I had £1000."

Cross-examined—Some of the things I found in a chest of drawers and others in a back room, but the pocket book I found in the small office off the bar. I had no difficulty in getting the documents; I received them on the same day as I arrested the accused. I locked all the things up, took the accused to the station, and then went back to the house.

Joseph Betrikowski, examined—I live at 30 New Street, Kennington Park Road. I know the Polish language. I have made a correct translation of the documents produced, and also of the little book, which is a book containing 500 household prescriptions. On the front page there appears the name "S. Klosowski." One of the papers, dated 29th October, 1882, certifies that on 15th December, 1865, Antonio Klosowski, a carpenter, and a native of the village of Nagorna, with two witnesses, arrived at Kolo, and stated that Emilie, the wife of Klosowski, had given birth to a child on the previous morning, whose name was Severin. The next paper is dated 19th December, 1880, and is a certificate to the effect that Severin Klosowski, son of Antonio, attended the Krasseninsk School from October, 1873, till June, 1878, and completed the full term of his studies, and that his conduct was good. The third paper is a certificate from the magistrate of the county of Zvolen to the effect that Severin Klosowski, a resident of the village of Zvolen, was a well-behaved man, and had never been found guilty of any crime,

Joseph Betrikowski

and it is dated 16th November, 1882. The next paper is a certificate issued to the surgical apprentice, Severin Antoniovich Klosowski, stating that he was in the surgery in the village of Zvolen from 1st December, 1880, to 1st June, 1885, that he had accurately discharged his duties, and that he was diligent, of exemplary conduct, and studied the science of surgery with zeal, dated 27th June, 1885. The next is a certificate dated 22nd October, 1885, to the effect that Severin Klosowski had been employed for four and a half years in the village of Tymenitsa as a surgery pupil, and had given skilful assistance to patients. There is also a certificate dated 2nd January, 1886, to the effect that Severin Klosowski, from 1st October, 1885, to 1st January, 1886, had received instruction in practical surgery at the hospital at Praga, and that his general conduct was good. (There were other certificates to the effect that Severin Klosowski had been employed as a surgeon-assistant, that he had fulfilled his duties with zeal, that he had been of good behaviour, and that he had performed his surgical functions with a full knowledge of the subject.*

George Schumann, examined—I am a barber at 33 Hill Street, Hoxton. I know the barber's shop underneath the public-house in High Street, Whitechapel, which was occupied by the accused. I saw him twice. The first time was twelve years ago, and it was eight or nine years before I saw him again. The second occasion was at Hastings, outside a barber's shop. There was a short woman assisting him in the shop. I am not sure of his name; it was some foreign name like Klosowski.

Cross-examined—I have been in England fifteen years.

And in the course of your business have you called on hundreds of people each year?—Yes, and I remember them all.

Mr. Elliott—Then I congratulate you.

William Henry Davidson, examined—I am a chemist, and I now live at 49 Upper Lewes Road, Brighton. In 1897 I was living at 66 High Street, Hastings, and carrying on the business of a chemist there. I have now retired. I was at Hastings for about eighteen years, and while there I used frequently to go to a barber's shop to get shaved. The

* See Appendix III.

accused was employed there, and he shaved me on many occasions. One day he bought several things from me, and asked me to let him have a particular poison. He purchased 1 ounce of tartar-emetic. We have to keep a copy of the sale of poisons. I produce my poison register book. The entry relating to the tartar-emetic sold to the accused is as follows: "April 3rd, 1897, name of purchaser, Mr. G. Chapman, 1 ounce of tartar-emetic." That is my writing. Then there follows: "Purpose for which it is required," but I cannot make out what is written here; it is in the accused's handwriting. It looks like "take" or "teke." He wrote that in my presence after he signed "G. Chapman." I knew him as Chapman, but I do not recollect his Christian name. I gave him the ounce of tartar-emetic, which is a white powder, and I wrote out the label which was put on the bottle in my own handwriting. (Shown label.) It reads: "W. H. Davidson, dispensing chemist. Poison, tartar-emetic. Dose, $\frac{1}{6}$th grain to $\frac{1}{4}$ grain: to be used with caution. 66 High Street, Hastings." The word "Poison" is printed, and I used a red label to indicate poison. I also sold the accused two or three old editions of medical books. (Two books produced.) I have no doubt these are the ones. I cannot find any other sale of tartar-emetic in my book. I saw in the newspaper an account of a woman named Chapman having died of this poison, and I went to the police and gave such information as I had.

Cross-examined—I am a registered qualified chemist. The accused was not a stranger to me.

Can you recollect having sold so large a quantity of tartar-emetic as this in any one year?—No. If I sold it, it would be entered in the book. It is very seldom asked for.

Have you during your professional life sold as large a quantity as this?—Yes, several times.

Was it not a very unusual request to have made to you?—No, because the accused had had several transactions with me.

Did he get some other poisons from you?—I think he did have some other poisons, but they would not come under Schedule I.

Did you demur at his wanting so large a quantity?—I do not know that I did. I cannot say what was passing through

my mind at the time, but from my conversation with him I knew he had a good knowledge of medicines, and so I let him have it.

You knew he was not practising as a medical man?—Yes, but no doubt he gave me a cogent reason why he wanted it, although I cannot say what it was now.

How many grains of tartar-emetic would be a fatal dose?—Two grains might be a fatal dose, and 12 certainly would be. I conformed to the law by answering the questions in the book and by knowing the man well.

Did you ask him what he required the poison for?—No doubt I asked him what he required it for.

Do you know now what the word "take" means?—No. I cautioned the accused and entered it in my book. I labelled it "Poison." I could do no more. I also put the dose on the label.

I put it to you, have you ever sold such a large quantity of tartar-emetic as this?—Some years ago I sold a pound of tartar-emetic to a man for the purpose of treating horses. I did not know whether the accused kept horses.

Did you, at the police court, say that the accused entered the particulars, and that you wrote the word "take"?—No; I do not know that it is "take." I do not know if I knew what it was then, but there must have been some reason. The object of the Act is to trace the poison.

Can you suggest what reason the accused gave you for buying the poison?—No. The label produced has certainly been on a bottle. If you put a label on a bottle and let it dry you can still get it off if you wet it, and you can stick it on to another bottle.

Did the books you sold to the accused specially deal with poison?—No.

Re-examined—There is no doubt that you sold to the accused 1 ounce of tartar-emetic?—No.

Under the Sale of Poisons Act were you entitled to sell it to him, provided he signed the book in your presence, stating the purpose for which he bought it?—Yes.

You had no idea he was going to make any improper use of it?—No. As far as I knew, he was a respectable man.

Whether you knew the man or not, you were bound to

enter, or cause to be entered, in the book the purpose for which it was required?—Yes.

Can you say if the word "take" means that he or somebody else was going to take it as a medicine?—No, but I think there is no doubt that that is the reason why I put the dose on the label—one-sixth to a quarter grain is the right dose for a diaphoretic. In larger doses it is an emetic.

Is the dose you name an infinitesimal quantity compared to the quantity you sold to him?—Yes.

You knew the accused fairly well?—Yes; I had had several transactions with him.

How much does an ounce of tartar-emetic cost?—Twopence. I used to buy about a pound at a time.

Can you recollect if he bought anything else on the same day?—No.

By a Juryman—Did you find him a very intellectual man to converse with?—Yes.

And are you positive that he is the man?—Yes.

George Godley (recalled), further examined—In searching the Crown on 25th October I found the two books that have been identified by Mr. Davidson. In one of them I found the small red label produced.

The Court adjourned.

Second Day—Tuesday, 17th March, 1903.

Mrs. Eliza Marsh, examined—I live at 14 Longfellow Road, Croydon, and am the wife of Robert Marsh. Maud Eliza Marsh was my daughter. She would have been twenty on 17th February last. She had been a barmaid in a situation in Croydon, and in August, 1901, she was out of a situation. She advertised for a situation as barmaid, and got an answer, in consequence of which I went with her to the Monument public-house in Borough High Street, where we saw the accused, who was going under the name of Chapman. We had some talk with him, and I noticed he had a ring on his finger, so I asked him if he was married or single. He said he was a widower. It was arranged that my daughter should live in the house. I asked him if there was any one else there, and he said that the top floor was occupied by a family. My daughter was engaged that day, and shortly afterwards she went to take up her situation and live there.

In September my husband was ill in hospital at Croydon. I had letters from my daughter from time to time, and about the middle of September she and the accused came to visit me at Croydon. The accused told me he had taken a great fancy to Maud, and that they wanted to be engaged, that he wanted to marry her. I said I would see her father when I went to the hospital. They went to visit my husband in hospital on another day, and they came to see me on several occasions. I remember on one occasion the accused brought down a paper which he said was a will in Maud's favour.

[This purported to be the will of George Chapman, appointing Maud Eliza Marsh to be the executor and trustee for herself and her own use and benefit; and that all interest in his business and household furniture, &c., were to be taken by Maud Eliza Marsh, as well as all money found on the premises at the time of his death. This was dated 13th December, 1901. It was unsigned, but was witnessed by Eliza Marsh and Alfred Samuel Marsh, and the witness identified the signatures as those of herself and her son.]

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Eliza Marsh

On 13th October I went to the Monument and saw some confetti lying about. My younger daughter Nellie was staying there on a visit at the time. On my arrival I saw Nellie, Maud, and the accused, and in the accused's hearing Nellie said, "Maud was married this morning." That was the first I heard of any marriage having taken place. The accused asked me to stop and have some dinner, which I did, and in his hearing again it was said that the marriage had taken place at the Roman Catholic Church. Maud was wearing a new wedding ring, and several other rings which the accused had given her. I asked about the certificate, and Maud said, "George has got it, and has put it with his other papers." Maud was not a Roman Catholic. I spent some part of the day there and then went home.

Just before Christmas, 1901, Maud and the accused removed to the Crown. I did not go there until my daughter was ill. In July, 1902, I got a letter from her. I went to Guy's Hospital, and saw her more than once there. After she came out I did not see her again until she was ill in October.

I had a married daughter named Mrs. Morris, and about 10th or 11th October I got a message from her, and on 20th October I went to the Crown. I was only with Maud for two days before she died. My husband had been on the Saturday before I went to see her, and Mrs. Morris was there when I got there. I saw the accused on the 20th after I arrived, and I asked him about Maud, and he said she was no better. He did not say then what was the matter with her. I went up to see her. Jessie Toon was in attendance on her. Maud was in bed and seemed very bad; she complained of great pain in the lower part of her stomach, and of excessive thirst. She kept vomiting. After I had been in the room a little while the accused came in and went to the bedside and asked her how she felt. He lifted her hand and felt her pulse. She complained of thirst, and he gave her a drink. I do not know if it was brandy and water, or only iced water. Ice was kept on the landing. She took what was brought to her. After she had taken it she vomited, and the vomit was of a greenish colour. The pain continued, and hot towels were put on her. I stayed there that night. The accused was in the room. Toon went home.

Mrs Eliza Marsh

I attended to my daughter during the night. The vomiting continued. It was still green. Only drink was given to her during the night. Sometimes she wanted brandy and water, and sometimes only plain water, as long as it was cold or with pieces of ice in it. I gave it to her during the night. The accused gave it to me. Maud vomited every time she took it.

I saw Dr. Stoker on the Tuesday, and in the accused's presence I asked him if he could do anything for my daughter. He said he was at his wit's end to know what to do. The accused did not say anything to that. On Monday I left the house for an hour or two. Toon was attending to my daughter then.

I have seen the accused administering the injections to my daughter. I did not see any liquid injection. The accused was frequently in the room during the daytime. When he came in, as a rule he went to her bedside and felt her pulse. I asked him what made Maud so bad, and he said he did not know, unless it was a rabbit she had eaten He said they had all partaken of it. I asked if it had made the others ill, and he said that he had felt bad, that he had been sick, or something to that effect.

Early on the Tuesday morning I made some gruel for my daughter and gave it to her, but she did not retain it. I do not know how many times during the night drink was given to her. I got the gruel out of the kitchen; the servant, Louisa Cole, got the milk for me. I saw Dr. Stoker towards midday, and shortly afterwards my own doctor from Croydon, Dr. Grapel, called, at my husband's suggestion. He saw my daughter with Dr. Stoker, and, after they had examined her, Dr. Grapel made a statement to me. I afterwards said to the accused, "Dr. Grapel thinks Maud has been poisoned." He said he could not think how, unless it was the rabbit. I said, "Dr. Grapel says you don't find arsenic in rabbits." The accused said, "I cannot think what it was then." The vomiting had continued during Tuesday, and there was also diarrhœa. The thirst continued. She had nothing to drink except water, or brandy and water. The accused generally brought the brandy. Sometimes I went down into the bar and asked him to give me a little.

Mrs Eliza Marsh

I remained in her room on Tuesday night. Toon left about 1 a.m. The accused was in the bar until closing time, and then he came up to the room. The same symptoms continued. After Toon left the accused remained in the room with me. He brought up some brandy in a small glass, which was placed on the safe by the bedside. I did not go to bed that night; I sat in the armchair. I may have fallen off to sleep for a minute or two while my daughter was asleep. The accused lay on the couch in the same room, in his clothes. During the early hours of the morning my daughter slept. She woke about 3 or 4 a.m. and asked for some drink. I gave her a little brandy and soda, which was kept in a small bottle on the landing outside. I only gave her about a tablespoonful of brandy. After she had taken it she vomited, and that was the last time she did so. Between 5 and 6 a.m. I took a little of the brandy myself in some iced water. After I had taken it I had severe diarrhœa and sickness and pain in the lower part of my stomach, which continued till about 7 a.m. I had about six attacks of diarrhœa and vomiting during that time. Maud's bedroom was on the second floor; the w.c. was on the first floor. When I had to go there the accused was left with my daughter. He opened the house to the public about 8 a.m., and a little while afterwards I gave the servant a message. About 9 a.m. Toon came. After having spoken to the servant I had again to go to the w.c.

When I got back to the room the accused was standing by the bedside. I do not know if he had anything in his hand then, but he got a little more brandy for Maud, because she said she was thirsty. Toon was there then. When I got back to the room the brandy was on the safe. I had told the accused what I was suffering from, and that he must send for the nurse. I told him I had both sickness and diarrhœa. I do not know what he said; he did not suggest any cause for it. He said that it was perhaps from sitting up two nights and having had no rest. He did not stay in the room after Toon came, and when he had gone Maud asked for something to drink. Toon offered her some brandy in the glass which was standing on the safe. I do not know whether it had water in it also. As Toon offered it to Maud she put up her hand and said, "No, no, no."

Mrs Eliza Marsh

Toon then gave her a little water. Toon then tasted the brandy, because she thought it was too strong. That was about 9 a.m., and about that time Maud had a kind of fit. There had been purging since the early morning, but not from the back passage. We used some cloths. That which came away from her was green. Her lips and hands were dark and had changed colour. I went and told the accused, and he came upstairs. He did not bring anything with him. He went to the bedside, and Maud said, "I am going, George," and the accused said, "Where?" She said, "Good-bye, George," and that was all she uttered. The accused stayed a little while and then went out. I saw him on the landing; he was crying and appeared greatly upset. The soiled cloths were taken out of the room, and I told the servant to put them in the dustbox.

Maud had died at 12.30, and a little while afterwards Dr. Stoker came. I heard the accused ask him for a certificate of her death. Dr. Stoker said he could not give one. I asked why. He said he did not feel satisfied about the way she had died, and he was surprised to find her dead. The accused said, "Why not?" Dr. Stoker said because he could not think why she had died so suddenly. The accused said she had died from exhaustion caused by diarrhœa and sickness. Dr. Stoker said he should like a post-mortem, and also said, "What caused the diarrhœa and vomiting?" The accused did not make any answer. I stayed in the house a day or two after the death. I remember the police coming on the Saturday. In the presence of Inspector Godley I asked the accused if he really had been married to Maud, and he said, "No." Godley had told me something before I asked that question.

Cross-examined—Was your daughter a well-behaved girl?—Maud was always a good daughter and a well-behaved girl. At the time I first saw the accused I was exceedingly anxious she should have a good situation, and that she should go there under respectable circumstances.

Did the accused tell you that Maud would not be alone with him at the Monument?—Yes, and that he had a woman in to help with the rough work.

Did you ascertain if there was any family on the top

floor?—No. Maud afterwards said that the people upstairs had cleared out on the Monday after she went there. She was to have gone there on the Thursday, but the accused wrote and asked her to go on the Monday instead, his reason being that he wanted to get the people out before she came in. He did not tell me that at the time.

Were there no servants there then?—No. I do not think that they had one at the Monument at all.

How often did you go there?—I only went there three times at the outside.

How old was your youngest daughter?—Fifteen years old.

How often did the woman come in to clean up?—I do not know, except by what my youngest daughter told me.

Did Maud often write to you?—Yes.

Did she appear to be happy and contented, by her letters?—Yes.

And did she speak in kindly terms of the accused?—Yes.

Did he often come with her to see you?—Yes.

Did you gather from the tone of her letters that she was fond of him?—Yes.

When did her letters to you cease?—They stopped just before Christmas, 1901. I had no letters from her during 1902 until she was in the hospital, because my son used to go up every week, and so I heard of her through him. I gathered that Maud was still in the same happy and contented condition up to the time of her going to hospital. Until Maud's illness the accused always treated me nicely, and always seemed to welcome me when I went to the Monument.

When did you first know that the accused was in love with your daughter?—I first knew that he was in love with Maud about three weeks after she had gone into the situation.

Did the accused not tell you on your first visit that he was going to marry Maud, or that he was very fond of her?—No; he told me that when they came on bicycles to see me at Croydon. My husband was then in the hospital, and they went to see him there.

Did the accused not on that day tell you that he was a Roman Catholic?—No, my daughter told me that he was. I did not go to the hospital when they went to visit my

husband, as it was not visiting time, but the nurse let them in as they had come down from London. I went there in the afternoon. It was on the Sunday after that that the accused brought down the will. My husband was still in the hospital.

Did you not ask the accused if he was going to marry Maud?—No. I asked Maud to let me know, which she promised to do; but I did not hear anything more about it until my other daughter told me that they had been married at the Roman Catholic Church in Bishopsgate Street.

Was Maud ill while at the Monument?—Yes, for about three days, but I do not know the date. I did not visit her then.

Do you know Florence Rayner?—No. She was not at the Monument.

Did Maud not have severe pains in the stomach while at the Monument?—Yes, and a Mrs. Bolling attended her. It was a kind of flooding, Maud told me.

Were the symptoms not something of the same kind as she had in her last illness?—Yes. She got quite well again. That was a long time before November, 1902.

Did she give you any reason to account for that illness?—No; she confided more in her married sister than she did in me, because I was always away. She once told me she thought she might be pregnant. That was some time after her illness at the Monument.

Do you know if she had a doctor when she was ill there?—No. Dr. Grapel had attended her at Croydon for her teeth and hysteria.

During the whole of your daughter's last illness did she ever suggest any cause for it?—No, never.

Did she ever say one word to lead one to suppose that she doubted her husband for a moment, or that he had been unfaithful to her with other women?—No. She appeared perfectly happy and contented to the last, apart from her illness. I only saw her at the Crown during the last three days of her life.

During these days did the accused appear to show her every possible attention that could be expected from him?—Yes; I was quite satisfied with his conduct up to the time of the suggestions by the doctor.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Eliza Marsh

Was the servant a respectable girl?—I believe so. I have no cause to complain with regard to her, and Toon treated Maud with every care and attention, and seemed anxious to do everything for her.

Who engaged the servant?—I think Maud engaged her. I think she had been there about four months. I did not know Dr. Stoker until I went to the Crown, and I then learned that he had attended Bessie Taylor, who had lived with the accused before my daughter had.

Did the accused appear to be quite contented at Dr. Stoker coming and attending Maud?—Yes, and he had a conversation with him as to her condition. I asked Dr. Stoker on Tuesday if he thought Maud would get better, and he said no, he did not think she would ever get up again. I said, "Is there anything you can give her to stop the sickness?" and he said, "No, I am at my wit's end to know what to do." I said, "If she dies, don't you think you ought to have a post-mortem? If you have one I will pay the expense out of my own pocket." That was before Dr. Grapel came.

Who suggested that Dr. Grapel should be called in?—My husband. I did not speak to the accused about him; I did not know he was coming. I was surprised at Dr. Grapel coming, and so was the accused.

Do you not know that the accused had arranged with Dr. Stoker to meet Dr. Grapel in consultation?—No. When Dr. Grapel came the accused sent the servant to Dr. Stoker to say that Dr. Grapel was waiting.

Was the accused present at the doctors' consultation?—I do not think so. After they had seen Maud Dr. Grapel said he would like to see me with Dr. Stoker. The accused was not then present.

Where was the brandy that you gave to Maud obtained?—It was obtained from the bar. It was the best the accused had got. I do not know if it was Martell's "Three Star" brandy. He got it out of a bottle, but he generally brought it up in a glass.

Where was the bottle?—The bottle out of which it was poured was, I believe, kept in the bar.

Did the servant also serve in the bar?—Yes, and she would be there when the accused was absent.

Mrs Eliza Marsh

Did you see the brandy poured from the bottle into the glass in the bar?—No.

Did you fetch some?—Yes. He took it from a bottle in the bar.

Do you know if it was the only bottle open at the time?—I do not know. Toon may have brought up brandy once or twice, and I may have fetched it two or three times. When it was brought up it was put in the tumbler on the safe.

Was there anything in its appearance which excited your suspicion?—No.

When you drank some yourself did you suspect it was wrong?—No.

How long afterwards was it that you took ill?—About two hours afterwards, and it was not until I suffered discomfort that I knew it was the brandy and water which caused my illness.

At the time you took it had you been nursing Maud continuously since the Monday?—Yes. I had not taken my clothes off, and I was feeling very tired and worn out, and that was the reason why I took the brandy. I felt I wanted something. I had not had anything to eat. I had only had tea and draught stout. The stout came from downstairs.

Did you ask Maud what she thought had made her bad?—Yes, and she said she did not know, unless it was the rabbit.

Did you tell the accused that?—I think I did. When Toon drank some brandy and water on the Wednesday morning she said, "Good God, that has burnt my mouth." She had only sipped it. I do not know if it was neat; it was just as it was on the safe, and as the accused brought it up.

Did it look like neat brandy?—I think so.

When the accused came up to see Maud did he seem to be anxious about her?—Yes. He was frequently up and down stairs to see how she was.

Did you regard his actions as those of a husband who was really anxious about his wife's condition?—Yes. When she died he closed her eyes and went out on the landing, where I saw him crying; he seemed dreadfully upset.

When Dr. Stoker refused to give a certificate did the accused plead for one?—No, because the doctor said he would have a private post-mortem.

Mr. Charles Mathews.

Who paid the funeral expenses?—The accused.

Had he anything to do with the making of the gruel in the kitchen?—No.

Did he object to you having anything you wished?—No.

Was the food all prepared downstairs by the servant?—Yes. Maud did not have anything to eat while I was there.

Re-examined—As far as you know, from the time Maud was ill at the Monument until the time she went to Guy's Hospital, was she quite well?—Yes.

When the accused brought the brandy upstairs, did you know where he had got it from?—No.

Do you know anything about its quality?—No. I suppose he would give her the best. I do not know whether it was mixed with anything or not.

Where was the water outside the room kept?—In a jug which stood in a pan with ice in it. Once or twice I got some water from the bar tap, because Maud said it was nicer there.

Do you know how much brandy Toon took?—No. She went downstairs and washed her mouth out.

Until Godley spoke to you had you any suspicion that Maud and the accused were not married?—No. When she was in the hospital I had asked her if they were, and she said "Yes."

By a Juryman—Was the accused in the room when you took the brandy which made you ill?—Yes.

Did he tell you not to drink it?—No. I do not know if he saw me do so, because he was lying down. When I gave Maud the gruel she said, "It is no use bringing anything; everything makes me sick."

Robert Marsh, examined—I am a labourer, and I live at 14 Longfellow Road, West Croydon. Maud Marsh was my daughter. I remember her going to the Monument in August, 1901. In the autumn of 1901 I was in hospital on two occasions, and whilst I was there Maud visited me. When I was in hospital on the second occasion she came, accompanied by the accused. On one of the occasions when she came alone I saw a plain wedding ring on her finger. She made a statement to me with regard to it.

Robert Marsh

I left the hospital just before Christmas, and I went to the Crown. I went there again in July, 1902. Maud was then in Guy's Hospital. I saw the accused and asked him how Maud was. He said she was ill and in Guy's, and asked me if I wanted to see her. I said, "Yes, that is what I have come for." I did not ask him what was the matter with her, and he did not tell me. I went to the hospital that same evening and saw Maud. She complained of vomiting and pains in her stomach. I went back to the Crown again and saw the accused, and I told him what Maud had complained of. He did not give me any explanation.

In October my married daughter, Mrs. Morris, stayed for a day or two at the Crown. I afterwards heard from her something with regard to Maud, and on 18th October I went to the Crown and saw Maud between 6 and 7 p.m. Passing through the bar I saw the accused, and I asked him how Maud was. He said she was very ill in bed. He did not say what was the matter with her, and I did not ask him. I went upstairs to Maud's bedroom on the second floor. Toon was nursing her. The accused went upstairs in front of me, and when we got into the room he took hold of Maud's pulse. He did not say anything. I asked Maud what she thought was the matter with her, and she said she did not know, that she had pains in her stomach, diarrhœa, and vomiting. I stayed in the room about three hours. She often showed signs of thirst. The accused gave her some water. He came up and down stairs every few minutes the whole time that I was there. When she asked for water the accused went out of the room to get it. He was not long absent. I did not know where anything was kept. When he gave her the drink she vomited it nearly every time. I did not notice the colour of the vomit, but I noticed that the water was discoloured and not clear. I saw the accused as I was going away. Nothing passed between us.

On Tuesday, 21st October, about 9 a.m., I made a communication to Dr. Grapel, who was our family doctor at Croydon. About 6 or 7 p.m. the same day I went to the Crown and saw the accused. I did not know if Dr. Grapel had been by then, but the accused told me that the doctor had been. I asked how Maud was, and he said she was

very bad. I went upstairs with him. I thought Maud was better. I went up to the room twice. I remained there a little time. I went down again and saw the accused in the bar, and I said to him, "Maudie is very bad, is she not, George?" He said, "Yes." He did not say any more. I went upstairs again with him, and I said to him, "I think my daughter will pull through now, George," and he said, "She will never get up no more." I said, "Have you seen any one else like it?" And he said, "Yes." I said, "Was your other wife like it?" and he said, "Just about in the same way." He told me that Dr. Grapel had been, and said that he had already got one doctor in attendance, and he did not know what we wanted another for; we did not want fifty. I told him it was no good to make a fuss about the doctor, as I had sent him up. Before I had gone downstairs I thought Maud some better; I was quite pleased at the way she spoke to me. That was the last time I saw her alive. The next day, about 4 p.m., I had a telegram announcing her death. I showed it to Dr. Grapel about five o'clock.

Cross-examined—Were you always on the best of terms with the accused?—Yes. I minded his house for him on two occasions.

Did you always find him pleasant and agreeable?—Yes; he always answered my inquiries about my daughter perfectly frankly. He used to come down sometimes to see me with Maud, and, as far as I could see, she was very happy with him. I thought he treated her very well.

When you said to him, "Have you seen any one else like it?" did he say "Yes" quite readily?—Yes, and he had no hesitation in saying about his other wife, "Just the same way."

When the accused went out of the room to get anything did he appear to be gone any longer than Toon was when she went to get anything?—No.

Why did you get Dr. Grapel to come?—I suspected the accused on the 18th, and that is why I told Dr. Grapel to go. I did not like him getting the water and giving everything to her himself.

Did you offer to do it?—No, the woman was there to do

it, but he would not let her. I did not do it, because I did not know where the things were.

Did you see him mix anything?—No.

Did you not see Toon fetch anything?—No, I never saw her fetch anything; she was not always in the room when I was there. I did not know where the brandy came from or where it was kept. When I kept the house for him the brandy was kept downstairs. I did not know that there was any Martell's "Three Star" brandy.

Did you see any of the brandy which was for Maud poured out?—No. I did not know what class of brandy it was. I was not left alone with Maud for more than five or six minutes at a time.

When you were alone with her did she ask you for anything to drink?—No.

Was any obstacle put in your way to go and see her?—No.

By Mr. Justice Grantham—How did you come to call in Dr. Grapel?—In consequence of something that occurred to me on the Saturday, I went and saw Dr. Grapel on the Tuesday.

It did not occur to you to see him on the Sunday?—No, I did not think it necessary to see him on the Sunday, but somehow I kept thinking it over, and I got my youngest daughter to go up and see how Maud was, and she came back and told me she was very bad.

By a Juryman—Did you call in Dr. Grapel because the accused had said that his former wife had suffered in the same way?—No; I was suspicious before that.

Mrs. Louisa Sarah Morris, examined—I am the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Marsh, sister of the late Maud Marsh, and wife of Edward Morris. At present I am living with my parents at Croydon. I have been married five years. I visited Maud at the Monument from time to time. I remember her being in Guy's Hospital in July and August, 1902. I went to see her there. Afterwards, on one occasion, I went to see the accused at the Crown. I told him that Maud had asked me to come down for some things. He said he would take them himself, but not then. I stayed at the Crown while he went to Guy's. On one occasion he told me that Maud was suffering from constipation. Maud had told me it was diarrhœa. I said it was funny, and I could not

make it out. He said, "She should have done as I told her." I asked him what that was, and he said, "She should have took the medicine I give her." I said, "She never would take medicine," and that it was funny the doctor could not find out what was the matter with her. He said, "I could give her a bit like that" (snapping his fingers), "and fifty doctors would not find out." I said, "What do you mean?" He walked away and said, "Never mind."

I saw Maud on more than one occasion at the hospital. I saw her on the day she left at the Crown. I do not know the date. She was sitting on a chair in the bar. She appeared very ill, and I told her she had no business there. I made her go upstairs and lie down. She could not go up by herself, so I had to help her. I visited her subsequently. Sometimes I found her well and sometimes unwell. She was generally up. On one or two occasions I found her lying down.

On Wednesday, 8th October, I went there and I saw the accused in the garden. He said I should find Maud upstairs. I went upstairs and found her not at all well; she was complaining of diarrhœa and sickness, and said she did not know what was the matter with her. On Saturday, the 11th, I got a letter from her, in consequence of which I went to see her. I stayed there until the Monday. When I saw her on the Saturday she was very bad and in bed, and she was suffering from vomiting and diarrhœa. On the Sunday I gave her some bovril, which I prepared myself. The servant brought it up from downstairs. She had a small piece of toast with it. She was not sick immediately afterwards, but about half an hour later I gave her some draught ginger beer, which the accused gave me from the bar, and she was sick with it. She had brandy at different times. The accused brought it up from downstairs. It was left on the safe by the side of the bed. She was very thirsty, and told me her throat seemed to burn her. I did not see the accused bring up anything besides brandy. On the Saturday she was too bad to take anything. In fact, for some time she did not know me. On the Saturday evening she only had brandy and soda—she kept on asking for it. She kept on being sick. On the Sunday morning she seemed better up to dinner-time. She sat up in bed and read a newspaper.

Mrs Louisa S. Morris

On the Saturday evening I had washed her and made her comfortable. I then went home to get some things. I was away about an hour and a half, and when I returned she did not know me. The accused was with her when I left, and I asked the servant to give her "an eye" every now and again. She vomited a little on the Sunday morning; she brought green water up. I saw no sign of the bovril. For dinner she had pork, potatoes, greens, a piece of bread, and a glass of ginger beer. That meal stayed on her stomach. She remained in bed. I stayed with her until 3.30 or 4 p.m. When I left she appeared to be pretty well; she was propped up in bed reading the paper. I did not go out of the house, but I was out of her room for about an hour and a half. I left the accused in the room with her, and when I came back she was very bad and quite helpless. Before I went into her room I saw the accused in the bar, and he asked me if I was cold. I said, "What do you mean? How is my sister?" He said, "I don't know; I will go and see." I went up to her room and found her very bad. I do not know if she saw me; she seemed so drowsified. We just lifted her out of bed and back again, and she seemed to go to sleep. I stayed in the room with her all the evening. She complained of pain in her side and asked for a drink. She was given ginger beer or brandy. The brandy was brought from downstairs by the accused. During the evening he brought up a bottle of champagne and gave Maud some. I stayed with her until between 1 and 2 a.m. After the accused had finished in the bar he came upstairs, and I said, "Can I stay with her?" He said, "There is no need." I said, "Will you call me if she is worse?" He said, "Very likely." I then went upstairs to sleep in a room overhead. I did not leave the house.

I saw Maud again the next morning, and she seemed very drowsy and no better. She had a little drop of tea. I do not remember if I made it or the servant. I do not think it agreed with her, because she only drank half of it. The nurse was not there during these days. I left at 2 p.m. and went home.

I returned to the house on Monday, the 20th, and I found Maud very bad. She did not speak to me. The nurse was

there then. Maud vomited during the day. She had diarrhœa, and was in great pain. The vomit was green. She could not take any food. She was having injections. I did not see who gave them to her. I saw the accused in the bar and asked him if he ought not to have another doctor to her. Dr. Stoker had been to see her when my mother and I were there. He said he was at his wit's end to know what to give her. The accused said he had got the best doctor, and if one could not do it fifty could not. My mother said to the accused, "Don't you think you had better have another doctor?" and, as far as I can remember, he said, "No, it is no good." I left that evening, leaving my mother with Maud. I never saw her alive again.

Cross-examined—Did you see a good deal of the accused and Maud when they were living together?—I did.

Do you know if there was much trade at the Crown?—I do not know, but they seemed to be getting on nicely.

Had the accused any barmaid or barman?—No, there were only himself, Maud, and the servant to serve in the bar. When my sister was ill and the accused had to leave for a few minutes, the servant looked after the bar.

Did you see much of your sister when she was at the Monument?—No.

Do you remember her being ill for three days while she was there?—No, but I heard of it. She did not speak to me about it.

Were you on very good terms with Maud?—We were on very good terms indeed, and she took me into her confidence.

Up to the time of her last illness did she seem happy and contented?—Yes, at times. She used to complain that the accused would not let her go out; she had to stay in the bar or up in the house.

Do you know if he was jealous of her?—I do not know if he was jealous of her, or if he went out himself. He was generally working in the bar.

Was Maud not very much distressed about not having a family?—Yes; she told me she was very unhappy to have no family. I used to take my baby to the house when I went to see her, and she would sometimes on such occasions get very distressed and cry a good deal.

Mrs Louisa S. Morris

Was she very fond of children?—Yes, she said how grieved she was that she had not a baby of her own. She said she had been married thirteen months, and she thought it was nearly time she had some little ones. I said, "I do not know anything about it; speak to George about it." She said, "Oh, he does not want any, but as soon as he has done business and made enough he does not mind how many I have."

Did you think she wanted matters hurried up a bit?—Yes.

Did she ever say anything to you about taking anything herself?—No. I never saw her taking anything. I told the accused that Maud wanted some things in the hospital; I said she wanted some cream cracknels and Peter's milk chocolate.

Did you sometimes find her better than at others while she was in the hospital?—Yes.

How long was she there?—I think she was there three weeks.

Did you see her shortly after she came out?—Yes.

Did she not seem at all well then?—No. She ought not to have been in the bar; she ought to have lain on the couch like a convalescent. While I was sitting with her from Saturday to Monday I said to the accused, "Don't you think it is funny Maud has turned like this?" and he said, "It is constipation." I said, "That seems funny, as she had diarrhœa when she was with me just a short time ago." She had been over to see me before she went to the hospital, and she had diarrhœa then, and complained of pain. When the accused said, "She should have taken the medicine I gave her," I thought he meant she should have taken it for the constipation.

Did Maud tell you that the accused had given her some medicine and she would not take it?—Yes.

Did she object to going to the hospital at first?—I do not know, but when they said she would have to go a second time she objected.

Did you hear her say she did not like being messed about by a doctor?—No. She asked me not to let her go. When I went to the Crown on 11th October she kept on having drinks, and if she only took a drop of water she was sick. I did not have any of the ginger beer.

When the accused brought up the champagne did you have

any of it?—I sipped it, but I did not like it. I have had some champagne which I liked.

Did the accused have any?—No. He gave Maud two or three lots. I drank out of the same glass as she did. When he poured hers out I asked him what it was and he said, "Champagne." I said, "Give me a drop." He poured a drop out, and I tasted it. I said, "I don't like that," and I pushed it away.

Do you know if the glass was empty when he poured what he gave you into it?—No, because he was turned away from me. It had a funny taste—not like champagne generally has—and when I said I did not like it he threw it into the chamber.

Who had cooked the pork and vegetables for the dinner?—The servant and I, and Maud said she would like to have some. She seemed so much better I had a good mind to go home that night. She had her dinner, and seemed all the better for it.

Did you draw the ginger beer that she had from the barrel?—Yes.

Did you see where the brandy was that was brought up by the accused?—No. I saw a bottle with "Martell 'Three Star'" on it, but I did not see any of the brandy that the accused brought up poured out.

Was the brandy ever brought up by anybody else?—No. I only took up the ginger beer. I do not know if my mother took any up. When she came I left. The soda water was drawn from a syphon in the bar.

By Mr. Justice Grantham—Did you ever hear that the accused was not an Englishman?—My sister told me he was an American.

Had you any idea that "Chapman" was not his real name?—No, I never had any idea that that was not his real name.

And you had no idea he was a Pole?—No.

Daisy Harriet Helen Marsh, examined—I am a sister of the deceased Maud Marsh, and I live with my parents at West Croydon. I am fifteen years old. I remember Maud going as a barmaid to the Monument. I went and stayed with her there. The accused was living there. One Sunday they went

out together between 10 and 11 a.m. and returned just before 1 p.m., and Maud showed me a wedding ring on her left hand. The accused was present. Maud said she was married. She did not say anything as to where the marriage had taken place, but I understood that they had been married that morning. Later that day my mother came to the house and dined there. I cannot fix the date. I stayed in the house for about two months after that. I only went to the Crown twice with my father.

Cross-examined—Did Maud say that she had been married at the Roman Catholic Church in Bishopsgate Street?—Yes.

Had you seen a ring on her finger before that Sunday?—No.

Was the accused kind to you?—Yes.

Did he and Maud seem very happy together?—Yes; he seemed to be kind to her.

Did you help your sister in the house?—Yes.

Alice May Marsh, examined—I live at 63 St. James's Road, Forest Hill, and I am a daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Marsh. I went to the Crown last summer and saw my sister and the accused there. I took her to Guy's Hospital, and after she came out I got a postcard from her and went again to the Crown. I saw the accused in the bar. I did not expect to see him. I said, "I thought you were ill in bed," and he said, "It would not do for both of us to be in bed." He did not look ill. I asked him where Maud was, and he said, "In bed, dying fast." I went upstairs and found Maud sitting up in bed. She complained of constipation and great pain. She had some senna tea in her hand. I then went down and saw the accused, and said to him, "I think Maud ought to have a doctor, or else go to the hospital." He said she was not to go to the hospital but to a doctor—that she was not to go to the hospital, because he did not want the fellows to mess her about. I went up again to Maud. She got out of bed. She was very weak, and it took her an hour to dress. When she was dressed we went out together. Before we left the accused gave her 2s. 6d. We went to a doctor round the corner, but I do not know his name. He was not at home, so we went to Guy's. She was examined

there and had some medicine. I left her there and went back to the Crown.

I told the accused where we had been, and he appeared cross and said, "That is all she wanted to go for, for those fellows to mess her about." I said, "The doctor was not at home," and he said, "She could have waited a little while." In about an hour Maud returned and told the accused where she had been, and that she had fainted at the hospital. I did not hear what he said to her then, as I went to the far end of the bar. I next saw Maud when she was in the hospital, and after that I saw her on 20th October. She was vomiting. The vomit was green, and she complained of pains and diarrhœa. She appeared to be thirsty, and water was given to her. Toon and the accused were attending to her. The accused injected a beef tabloid. I saw him feeling her pulse. I left about 6 p.m. That was the last time I saw her alive. On 23rd October I went to the Crown again. Maud's body had then been removed to the mortuary. I had tea with my mother and aunt and the accused. While we were having tea the accused said to me, "There is a chance for you as barmaid now. Will you come?" I said, "No, thanks, London does not suit me."

Cross-examined—Do you know where the meat tabloids were purchased?—No. I do not know who got them.

Did you hear your sister object to going to the hospital the second time?—No.

Did you take it as a joke when the accused said there was a chance for you as barmaid?—I do not know whether I took it as a joke or not.

By a Juryman—The accused had asked me to go and live with him and my sister.

Mrs. Jessie Toon, examined—I live at 23 Eltham Street, Borough, and I am the wife of Frank Toon, who is a labourer. I used to go to the Crown. I knew the accused. On 16th October I went to the Crown, and he asked me if I could do a bit of nursing. I said, "It all depends what it is; is it a miss or is it a premature?" (I meant a miscarriage.) He said, "No, nothing of the kind; she has been sick, and the doctor has ordered her to have food injected." I said, "I don't understand anything of that kind; you want an

Mrs Jessie Toon

experienced nurse." He said, "Can you recommend me any one?" I said, "Yes, I think I know an old lady who would be all right to do that." He said, "Will you go and see her?" I said, "Yes, I will go now." I went and saw the old lady, and she said she would go at six o'clock. I went back and told the accused. At six o'clock I went and fetched the old lady, and we went to the accused together. She went upstairs with the accused, but soon returned and said he wanted some one to be there altogether, which she could not do.

The accused then asked me to go and see Maud, and I went upstairs. She was in bed and crying. I asked her what she was crying for, and she said she was ill, and that if she could not get any one to look after her she would have to go to the hospital, which she did not want to do. I said, "I don't understand it, Mrs. Chapman, but would you like me to look after you?" She said, "Yes, please, Jessie, if you will." I noticed that she had been sick. I stayed with her that evening. She drank a great quantity, and everything she drank she vomited within a few minutes. The vomit was green. She complained of thirst. She chose anything she wanted to drink, and I would go to the foot of the stairs and ask the accused for it, and he would give it to me. At first I used to get water for her to drink from the tap, but the accused told me I was not to fetch any more, and he gave me what I wanted in a jug from the tap in the bar. He took the jug from me and filled it and brought it back. Everything I gave her was given to me by the accused. She had diarrhœa that night. It was green. She was taking no food through her mouth when I went there. The accused told me she was fed with a small syringe, with a rubber thing, with beef tea and egg and milk in it. He prepared the injections in the kitchen and administered them himself. He brought them up into the bedroom in a half-pint tumbler. After he had given the injections he took the tumbler and the syringe and washed them himself.

The injections did not stay with the deceased, they came back again quickly, and she was in terrible pain. No one ever brought anything into the room for her use except the accused. I did not see where he got what he brought or how

it was mixed. Dr. Stoker sent some medicine to be kept by the side of the bed, but she never took any of it. It was in a little phial bottle. The accused took it into the kitchen with him, and brought it back when he came in with the injection. I saw two partly full bottles of medicine there. They remained there until after her death. There were labels on them. When the attacks of diarrhœa came on I had to help her out of bed. She appeared to be suffering and about to go into a fit; it was as much as I could manage to hold her, there was such dreadful pain. Her limbs would go stiff, and she complained frequently of thirst.

On 19th October she said her throat was burning, and that it seemed to be always burning. On 20th October the accused came in with his stethoscope in his hand. He first of all pulled the deceased's eyes down and examined them, and then he undid her nightdress and put the stethoscope to her heart and listened. I never saw him use the stethoscope on any other occasion. There was no one else there with me.

On 22nd October I went home about 1 a.m., and I was sent for about 7.45 a.m. I said to the accused, "What is the matter; is she worse?" He said, "No, the old mother is bad now." I said, "What is the matter with her?" He said, "Sickness and diarrhœa." I said, "What, two of them now!" He said, "You had better go upstairs, Jessie, and tell her to get to bed out of your way, the old cat." I then went up and saw the deceased. Her arm about half-way up was port wine colour, and her face and round her mouth was black. Shortly after I got there the accused brought half a tumbler of brandy into the room. I saw him put some water into it and give it to the deceased to drink. He nearly filled the tumbler with water, which he got from a jug on the side of the safe. The deceased drank some of it, and shortly after the accused had gone out she asked for another drink. I took up the brandy she had left, and she said, "No, no, no!" I said, "What will you have, then?" She said, "Water," and I gave her a drink of water. I then said to Mrs. Marsh, "Perhaps it is too strong for her." I tasted the brandy myself and it burned my throat. I went downstairs and took a cup from the dresser and cut a piece of bread and butter, and washed my mouth out, to take the nasty taste away.

Mrs Jessie Toon

The day before I had had a conversation with the accused about something I had overheard Dr. Stoker say. He had told Mrs. Marsh that should anything happen he would go to the expense of having a post-mortem examination himself. I told the accused what I had heard. He said, "That is her doings; she wants to have her cut about and show me up, the old cat. Be careful, Jessie, what you say to her, and take particular notice what she says to you, and in the course of conversation just ask her if there is anything wrong or any foul play." He never asked me afterwards if she had said anything. The deceased was not sick on the Wednesday morning. Everything passed through her, and I had to use a number of towels. I put them with the dirty clothes in the lumber room.

The day after the deceased died I went into the Crown to see the body, but the accused would not tell me if it was removed or not. Mrs. Marsh told me it had been removed. The same day the accused said to me, "What colour was the motion you took from her?" I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Was it black?" I said, "No, green, just the same as she vomited." He did not say anything to that. On Friday I went to the Crown again. I saw the accused, and he asked me how much he was in my debt. I asked was he satisfied with what I had done for her, and he said, "Yes, perfectly, Jessie, you have done all you could for her." I said, "15s. won't hurt you," and he gave me £1. He asked me if I could do some washing, and I said, "Yes." He said, "When can you come in?" I said, "Any time that suits you." He said, "On Tuesday?" I said, "You ought to have had those things washed out before, Mr. Chapman, they will be getting nasty." He said, "I have destroyed them." He said he would not give me any rum to drink. I said, "What for?" and he said, "Because you talk, Jessie, when you have rum." I said, "People ask me about Mrs. Chapman," and he said, "Well, I don't want you to have anything to say." I said, "Very well, if it is your wish I won't say anything; if they ask me no questions I won't tell them no lies." He said, "That is right, Jessie, I don't want you to say anything of what occurred upstairs."

Mrs Jessie Toon

Cross-examined—When were you employed by the deceased?—I was employed by the deceased about a fortnight before to clean the billiard room for her, and it was her wish that I should nurse her.

Were you sleeping in the house?—No; but on Friday I stayed all night. The other nights I left about 1 a.m. I went there again the first thing in the morning.

Had you free access to the deceased's room?—Yes. I was always there when food was given to her and when injections took place. The first day I had my meals by her bedside, but, being so sick, she could not bear the smell of my food, and I therefore went and had it with the servant in the kitchen.

Were you ever told not to go into the bar?—No.

When the accused was not there was he in the deceased's room?—Yes.

Who did the cooking?—The servant did the cooking and served in the bar as well.

How long were you there?—Five days altogether.

Did you try to get the deceased to take the medicine?—I once tried to get the deceased to take the medicine, but she said she could not.

Did Dr. Stoker come every day?—Yes.

Did you tell him she would not take the medicine?—Yes; that is why he had it put into the injections.

Did he tell you to tell him everything that happened?—No, he did not tell me to tell him everything that happened, but if anything was the matter I told him.

Did you tell him that she refused to take the brandy because it burned her mouth?—No, because she was dead when he came again. I burned my mouth with it about a couple of hours before she died.

Did you see the doctor after her death?—I did.

Did you then tell him anything about it burning the deceased's mouth or your own?—No.

Did you tell the accused about it?—No, I told Mr. Marsh. I did not tell the accused, because I did not think it important.

When did you first mention it?—When I saw Godley. I did not tell him of it the first time I saw him. I made a statement to him, which he took down in writing.

Mrs Jessie Toon

Did you in that statement say anything about the brandy burning your mouth?—I do not know if in that statement I said anything about the brandy burning my mouth, but I told him about the deceased's throat being burned. He took two or three statements from me.

You went into the witness-box at the police court on two occasions?—Yes.

And a week elapsed between each?—Yes.

Had you seen Godley in between, or did you make a statement to anybody?—No.

So far as you could see, did the accused and the deceased appear to be on very good terms?—Yes; he appeared to be fond of her and she of him.

Did he get everything she asked for?—Yes.

And did he constantly come to her while she was ill, and seem anxious about her?—Yes.

Louisa Beatrice Cole, examined—I used to live at 6 Bodysbridge Street, Blackfriars, and I was a servant at the Crown. I was engaged by the deceased in July. I did the cooking. I remember the deceased being ill and going to Guy's Hospital, then coming back again. One Tuesday in October, before her last illness, I remember having cold meat and potatoes for dinner. The accused and I had cold meat and potatoes, but the potatoes alone were put aside for the deceased, who used to take her dinner by herself in the middle of the day. In the afternoon she called me, and I found she had been sick. She went to bed and stayed there the rest of the day. She got up the next day, and towards the end of the week she took to her bed again. I remember Mrs. Morris coming. I did the cooking whilst the deceased was ill, and prepared anything that she wanted. I remember Toon coming. I did not do anything for the deceased after that or go into the deceased's bedroom. I remember some medicine bottles coming from Dr. Stoker. The accused came into the kitchen occasionally. I once saw him pour the injection from one glass into another. That was on the 19th of October, in the evening. The injection was already mixed. I did not see it prepared. I then went into the front room, and when I came back the accused had gone upstairs with it. I did not see the glass from

Mr. A. H. Bodkin.

which it had been poured left in the kitchen. A syringe was kept in a glass of cold water on the kitchen window-sill.

Cross-examined—Did the accused pour the injection from one glass into another perfectly openly?—Yes.

And anybody could see the syringe?—Yes.

Did you prepare any beef tea for the deceased?—No, I did not prepare any beef tea for the deceased, neither did I see the accused prepare any. I saw him put some beef tea on the fire to cook, but I was not there all the time. I sometimes attended to the bar, which is close to the kitchen.

How do you know that he made beef tea?—I know that he made beef tea, because when he went upstairs I went down to the bar and he took it up to the deceased.

Did the deceased's sister frequently come to the Crown, and had she every opportunity of seeing the deceased?—Yes.

While you were there did the accused and the deceased get on well?—Yes, as far as I could tell. He appeared to be fond of her, and she appeared to be attached to him.

He always treated her kindly, and, as far as he could, gave her everything she wanted?—Yes.

Re-examined—Was the beef tea prepared by the accused alone?—Yes. I went into the bar after he had prepared it, and he took it upstairs.

By Mr. Justice Grantham—What did you think he was doing when you saw him pouring something from one glass into another?—I thought he was cooling it.

It was not something taken from the medicine bottle?—No.

Do you know how to make beef tea?—No.

Dr. James Henry Targett, F.R.C.S., examined—I am assistant obstetric surgeon at Guy's Hospital. I remember a woman named Maud Chapman being admitted to a ward at Guy's on 28th July. I do not know the address she gave. She remained an in-patient till 20th August. I attended her.

What did she complain of?—She complained of great pain in the lower part of the abdomen. It came on in attacks of great severity. At times she had considerable fever.

What were the symptoms?—Her pulse was more rapid than it should have been. She had occasional sickness, and

her abdomen was extremely tender to the touch, so much so that I could not make a complete examination. She began to improve about 10th August. During the first fortnight her temperature went up to about 102. On 10th August her temperature began to fall, her pulse also began to improve, and there was a general improvement until she left.

What did you discover was the matter with her?—I thought she had peritonitis, but we never discovered any cause for it.

Why did you not discover the cause?—Partly because she was so tender, and there may not have been any cause. We could never form any clear idea what she was suffering from. Her temperature was normal when she went out. When she came in she was very ill.

Cross-examined—Was she anxious to leave?—I do not know if she was anxious to leave. I had no conversation with her.

Was the tenderness rather more marked on the right side of the abdomen than on the left?—Yes.

Does great pain always increase the temperature?—I am not prepared to say whether great pain always increases the temperature.

When she came in was she constipated?—Yes, but that was relieved by the next day. When the pain began to abate we made an examination, but we could not come to any clear conclusion as to what had been the matter with her.

Had you heard the history of her illness before she came to you?—I had heard the history of her illness before she came to us from the student in the ward. He would get from her an account of her illness.

By Mr. Justice Grantham—Have you had any experience of antimonial poisoning?—No. I should think that ten days would be a reasonable time for a person to recover from that poison if during that time no more was administered.

Florence Rayner, examined—Last June I became acquainted with Maud Marsh, whom I knew as Mrs. Chapman. I was afterwards retained to go as barmaid at the Crown. When I went there in June the deceased was apparently in good

health. After I had been there about a fortnight the accused kissed me and asked me to be his sweetheart and go to America with him. I used to take my meals with him alone. When he asked me to go to America with him I said, "You have got your wife downstairs; you don't want me." He said, "If I gave her that" (snapping his fingers) "she would be no more Mrs. Chapman." He said he would first send me to America, then sell the business and come on after me. During the second or third week after I had gone there the deceased had diarrhœa and sickness. I left before she went to the hospital. She was all right when I went away. I left because the accused came upstairs into my bedroom in the afternoon. He did not kiss me more than once, or say anything more about selling the business. I went to Forester's at Twickenham. The accused came there once. I asked him how the deceased was, and he said she was in the hospital suffering from constipation. He then said, "If you had not been such a fool you would have been at the Crown now."

Cross-examined—Were you employed by the accused as barmaid and servant?—Yes.

Did you take much notice when he asked you to go to America with him?—No; my dignity was hurt at the idea of a married man asking me to do such a thing.

Did the accused kiss you often?—He kissed me constantly when we were at meals together. He did not kiss me in front of his wife.

His kissing was a matter of daily occurrence?—Yes.

Did you not object?—I did not object; I could not help myself.

Why did you not tell his wife?—I did not tell his wife, because I did not like to.

Did you want him to go on kissing you?—I do not know if I wanted him to go on kissing me.

Why did you not leave?—I did not leave because I had gone there against my parents' wish.

How long did you stay?—I stayed on three or four weeks, and then the deceased told me that the accused said he must have some one stronger. I had fainted on the Saturday night from the stuff the accused had given me.

Florence Rayner

Was it not on account of drink that you were discharged?—The accused told my brother that he had discharged me on account of drink, but it was not true.

Will you swear that you said at the police court that you left because the accused had attempted to come into your bedroom?—Yes.

Did you say that before the coroner?—I may have said it before the coroner. I know I said it somewhere.

After you had left did you go to the accused for a reference?—Yes, and he told me to go away because I was the worse of drink, and not to come again until I was sober.

Were you drunk?—I was not drunk.

Were you not locked up next morning for being drunk?—I was locked up next morning for being drunk, but I was not drunk then. The police said I was.

And were you brought before the magistrate and fined 2s. 6d.?—Yes.

Were the accused and the police all wrong on that occasion?—Yes.

Did you think that the accused was in earnest when he asked you to go to America?—No, I thought it was a joke.

During the time that he was asking you to go were he and his wife on good terms?—Yes.

Did you ever see them quarrel?—No.

Was he always kind to her?—Yes.

And she always behaved well to him?—Yes.

Were there only signs of her being ill on one day?—Yes.

She was all right the next day?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Grantham—What happened when you went to the accused to get a reference?—When I went to get a reference he took me by the throat and threw me out.

Annie Chapman, examined—I live at 9 Hartington Road, Tottenham. I first became acquainted with the accused towards the end of 1893, when he was going under the name of Klosowski. He was employed as an assistant at Mr. Haddin's hairdresser's shop, West Green Road. I went there one day and saw the accused there and made his acquaintance. After that I went out with him for a little while. I think he said he was either single or a widower. He was living at Haddin's, and he proposed I should go as his housekeeper,

and after a time I did so. I lived with him as his wife; we passed as Mr. and Mrs. Klosowski. I went to live with him in November, 1893, and left him in November or December, 1894. At the time I first met him my name was Annie Chapman. In January or February, 1895, I went to consult a Mr. Bray, a solicitor's clerk.

Cross-examined—Did you see the accused in February or March, 1895?—Yes; he came on a bicycle one day to Albert Road, Tottenham, where I was living. I do not remember the number in Albert Road.

Have you had any letter or communication from him since February, 1895?—No.

How did you come to know about this case?—My sister read this case to me in the newspaper, and I went to the police court, but I did not give evidence there.

Where are you living at present?—I am living with some friends.

Where did you identify the accused?—I identified the accused in a passage at the Court from about ten other men.

Was there anybody else there like him?—No.

And did you go there expecting to see a man like him?—Yes.

Was he very much the same as what he was when he left you eight years ago?—Yes.

Re-examined—How long did you live with the accused?—I lived with him for a year.

And you have no doubt the accused is the man?—I have no doubt.

After you left him where did he go?—I heard he had gone to Whitechapel. He also had a shop opposite Bruce Grove Railway Station.

Did you go there to see him?—I went there one evening in January or February, 1895, and asked him to help me in my trouble; I was going to have a baby. I also asked him if he would give me a reference to get a situation. When I told him I was going to have a baby he did not take much notice.

Did he give you anything?—No.

Do you recognise that woman (Mrs. Klosowski)?—Yes, he brought her to the shop where I was living with him. He said she was his wife.

Annie Chapman

Did you all three live in the house for some weeks after that?—Yes, and then I left. That was the reason why I left.

Is the accused the father of your child?—Yes.

And are you English?—Yes.

Did the accused ever use your name while you were with him?—No.

By Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—The police came to me, and I told them my story. I did not know for certain that the father of my child was the accused until I saw him at the Court.

Who were you asked to identify?—I was told to see if there was any one there I knew, and I picked the accused out directly.

Dr. FRANCIS GASPARD GRAPEL, examined—I am an F.R.C.S., and I practise at 103 London Road, West Croydon. I have been the medical attendant of the Marsh family for some time. On Tuesday, 21st October, Mr. Marsh called on me, and in consequence of what he said I went about 3 or 4 p.m. to the Crown. I saw the accused, and I told him that I was a medical man from Croydon, and had come to see Dr. Stoker in consultation about his wife. He gave me the idea that he had never heard about it, and so I asked him if it was the Crown, as I thought I had come to the wrong place. He said there was a doctor already in attendance, and something about fifty others; I could not distinguish exactly what he said. I asked to see Mrs. Marsh. I stayed in the bar, and then saw Dr. Stoker, and together we examined the deceased. Her skin was sallow, jaundiced and muddy in appearance, tongue coated, her pulse fairly quick, and her breathing shallow. She was in a semi-comatose condition. I examined her stomach and found it was extremely tender to the touch; when I touched it she groaned and retched. I had a consultation with Dr. Stoker downstairs, and then saw Mrs. Marsh. Before leaving the house I asked for, and was shown, some of the vomit. It was green. Dr. Stoker and I were of opinion that she was suffering from some acute irritant poison, probably ptomaine. Later on the suspicion crossed my mind that it was not ptomaine poisoning, but repeated doses of arsenic. I formed that opinion before there was a post-mortem. After I heard of her death I sent a telegram to Dr. Stoker.

Dr Francis G. Grapel

Cross-examined—When did it cross your mind that it was arsenical poisoning?—It crossed my mind on my way home.

Did you not go back and tell Dr. Stoker or send any communication until after she was dead?—No. Bringing in a diagnosis of repeated doses of arsenic is tantamount to accusing some one of murder, and I had no proof whatsoever.

Did you believe she was likely to die then?—No. I was going to communicate with Dr. Stoker next day.

Who was the first person you saw at the Crown?—The accused. I had a desultory conversation with him.

Did he send for Mrs. Marsh?—Yes, he sent for Mrs. Marsh before I saw Dr. Stoker.

Did he also send for the doctor?—Yes.

Did the accused put the slightest obstacle in your way of seeing the deceased?—No.

Did he seem anxious?—It did not strike me that he seemed anxious.

Did you question him about the symptoms?—No. He said she had been suffering from constipation.

And did he tell you how she had been treated?—No. I did not say more to him than I could help. On the Wednesday morning I told Mr. Marsh that I was going up to London as early as I could on that day to see Dr. Stoker, with the idea of having the excreta saved and examined.

Did you examine Mrs. Marsh?—No.

Did you hear of the rabbit?—Yes. I think it was Mrs. Marsh who told me that her daughter had been poisoned by a rabbit, and that the servant had also been poisoned. I afterwards told the father that one did not get arsenic in a rabbit.

Did it not occur to you to investigate the story of the rabbit?—No.

Did you not feel justified in at once telling the father what your suspicions were?—No; even a doctor must have time to think about a case before he renders himself liable to anything legal.

Why did you not go to London on the Wednesday?—Because I heard of the deceased's death.

Did you take part in the post-mortem?—No.

The Court adjourned.

Third Day—Wednesday, 18th March, 1903.

Dr. James Maurice Stoker, examined—I am an L.R.C.S., and I practise at 221 New Kent Road. On 10th October, about 5 p.m., the accused called at my surgery, which is about half a mile from where he lives, and said he wanted a bottle of medicine for diarrhœa and vomiting. He led me to believe it was for his wife. He said she had been at Guy's Hospital suffering from the same thing. He also said she was not his wife, but she passed as such. I gave him a bottle of medicine consisting of catechu, chalk, bismuth, and opium. The same evening, about 10.30, I went to the Crown, and found the deceased in bed on the second floor. The accused went into the room with me. The deceased said she was suffering from diarrhœa and vomiting, and great pain in the stomach. I examined her stomach. There was great pain and tenderness all over the abdomen. I told her to continue taking the medicine I sent, and said she was to have no solid food, but to go on a milk diet. I ordered her soda water and milk, boiled milk, brandy, beef tea, and ice. I ordered the ice to stop the sickness. She did not complain of any great thirst then.

I went to see her the next day. The accused again went into the room with me. She was no better. The accused then said she had been treated at Guy's Hospital, but they did not quite understand what was the matter with her there. The deceased told me that they had said she had peritonitis. The symptoms she complained of would be consistent with peritonitis. I saw her again the next day, Sunday. She was very much better. I changed the medicine and gave her bismuth, morphia, and ipecacuanha. That was for the soothing of the stomach. I saw her again on the 13th, and she was then as bad as ever. She had diarrhœa and vomiting; I saw them both; they were mixed together. It was an ordinary yellow brown mixture. I saw her again on the 14th, and she was no better.

About the fifth day I noticed she had spasms; they came on with great pain in the stomach; she got rigidity of the

muscles of the leg, and they passed off in about half a minute. They did not synchronise with the sickness; they came on independently. On one occasion she had two in about five minutes. I could not then form an opinion as to what caused them. I saw her again on the 15th; she was no better. I asked the accused if she was having the milk diet, and he led me to believe she was having all I ordered. There was no one else to ask. I was not there when anything was administered.

She was very much worse on the 15th, and on that day I stopped all food through the mouth except the bismuth powders. She could not even keep the medicine down. I ordered her to be fed by injections through the rectum. She was to have egg, milk, and beef tea as a mixture. I could not then form any opinion as to what she was suffering from. I thought the symptoms might be those of gastro-enteritis, which is inflammation of the stomach and the bowels. At that time I had not the slightest suspicion of any foul play. I suggested to the accused that she should be taken to the hospital, but the deceased objected and began to cry. I then suggested a nurse, and the next day, finding there was still no one there, I spoke to the accused about it. He said he had tried to get one, and that she would come in the following day. On this day I found that the deceased could not retain the bismuth powders which had been given to allay the irritation of the mucous membranes of the stomach. I stopped them and advised her to be fed entirely with the injection. I got beef tea suppositories, and told the accused to give her everything iced. I do not know whether up to that time she had had any injections.

On Friday I saw the nurse, Toon, for the first time, and I gave her directions about the food and injections. I did not know if she knew anything about giving injections. The accused was there when I gave Toon the instructions. I thought Toon was carrying out my directions. I called again on Saturday, the 18th, and I found the deceased very bad, vomiting and diarrhœa. I saw the vomit; it was slimy and green. The green would be due to the irritation of the stomach and gut. I do not think I visited her on the Sunday; I know I missed one day, and I think it was the Sunday. The next time that I saw her after the Saturday I found

her much weaker, and with the same symptoms. I asked the nurse about the injections, and she told me she did not even retain these. I told her she ought to reduce them to half the quantity to try if she could retain any liquid. The accused was there when I said that. I had no idea that it was the accused who was giving the injections.

I remember seeing Mrs. Marsh on Tuesday, the 21st. I had some conversation with her, and later that same day I was sent for to meet Dr. Grapel. The accused was not present. The deceased was very weak and semi-unconscious. I had some conversation with Mrs. Marsh on the landing about the death certificate on the Monday. I called on the Wednesday about 3 p.m., and then heard that the deceased had died at 12.30. A message had been sent to me, but I did not receive it, as I was out visiting. When I went there the Crown was open for business; there was nothing to indicate there had been a death there. When I saw her on the Tuesday I had no reason to anticipate she would die so soon. On the Monday she was about as bad as she could be, and I could not say if she would get well.

On the Wednesday I went into the bedroom. The accused and Mrs. Marsh were there. The accused was wiping his eyes. I asked when the deceased had died, and I was told. I then went out on to the landing and had a conversation with the accused. I said I should like a post-mortem, as I could not account for the cause of her dying. He said, "What use is it?" I did not say anything about the certificate then. I went back into the room with him. Mrs. Marsh was there. I told her that I wanted a post-mortem, as I could not account for the cause of death, and she said, "I must leave it to her husband." I said that I did not know what was the cause of death, and I might be asked what had caused her death. The accused said that she had died from exhaustion. I asked what caused the exhaustion, and he said, "Diarrhœa and vomiting." I asked what caused the diarrhœa and vomiting, and he made no answer. I said I could not give a certificate for her; I would have to have a post-mortem or an inquest. I told the accused I only wanted a private post-mortem, just to satisfy myself as to what had caused the diarrhœa and vomiting. I then said I should

have to make arrangements for the removal of the body to the mortuary, and I went to the proper authorities and the mortuary keeper. The body was removed early the following morning. I communicated with Dr. Cotter, who lives in Caledonian Road. The next day I got a telegram from Dr. Grapel before I made an examination of the body.

On 23rd October I made a post-mortem examination with Dr. Cotter. I examined the liver, the kidneys, the lungs, and the ovaries. They were healthy. I examined the intestines and the stomach externally. I could not arrive at any opinion as to the cause of death. I did not see anything to account for the symptoms causing the death. I had taken two glass bottles with me when I went to make the examination, and I had taken pains to see that they were chemically clean. I removed the stomach and its contents from the body without opening it. I tied it up and put it straight into one of the bottles. I also removed portions of the rectum and the liver and put them into the other bottle. The deceased was not pregnant. There were no traces of pregnancy or any affection of the womb. I took the bottles away myself and sealed them up, and the next day I took them to Dr. Bodmer, of the Clinical Research Association. I got a communication from him in the evening, and then I had a consultation with Dr. Cotter, and, as a result, in the early morning of Saturday, the 25th, I communicated with the police. I also inquired for the coroner's private address, and immediately sent a communication to him. That Saturday was the Royal Procession through South London, and the coroner's office was shut. I could not get his private address at the police station, and, although I sent a letter to his ordinary address, I knew he could not get it until Monday morning. I took the letter up to the city myself about 1 a.m. to post it, as it was after posting time at Croydon. The inquest was not held until the Tuesday. I think the coroner's officer came to me on the Monday.

After the accused was arrested I saw the bottles of medicine which I had sent to the deceased. (Bottles produced.) I make up my own medicines, and I made up these bottles. The small one had opium and water in it; that is a sedative, and it was for injection to relieve the pain in the rectum.

Dr James M. Stoker

I cannot fix the date when I ordered that. This other bottle now shown me I should say had bicarbonate of soda and prussic acid in it. I did not put any antimony or tartar-emetic into any of them. I do not keep any antimony in my surgery, and I had none at this time. I have had none for ten years. I do not know if antimony now is accepted as a medicine; I do not know much about it. I never use it. I kept a preparation of arsenic, but I did not put any arsenic in the medicine. (Shown powders.) I think these are some of the bismuth powders I prescribed. I had some of the bismuth remaining in my surgery after the death of the deceased, and I handed it to Inspector Godley with a view to its being analysed. I was present at the post-mortem examination made by Dr. Stevenson.

Cross-examined—How long have you been in practice?—I have been in practice ten years in London. I have had a good many cases of ptomaine poisoning, but not of antimonial poisoning.

Have you ever had a case where poison had been deliberately administered?—No; this is my first experience of a case of this kind, and I hope it will be the last.

Do you know that tartar-emetic is in the Pharmacopœia as a medicine?—Yes, but I have never had occasion to employ it.

Have you ever had any practical experience of the tartarisation of antimony?—No, and I do not think I should recognise it if I came across it in a post-mortem. If antimony was present in the deceased's stomach when I took it out and placed it in the glass jar I should not recognise it. I do not put myself forward as having any special knowledge on that subject.

Should you not have analysed the deceased's vomit yourself?—No.

Should you not have tried to trace the presence of antimony?—No.

Did the accused in any way object to your making an examination of the vomit or of the excreta?—No. I could have taken it away for examination. The vomit was only unusual because it was green, but not more so than you would see if the patient was suffering from a bilious attack. I have constantly seen vomit as green as that.

Did you see any blood in it?—No, but it may have been there when I did not see the vomit. I only saw it on two occasions. I only saw the fæcal matter once, and I saw no blood then. I prescribed altogether six 5-grain bismuth powders. I am not aware that bismuth gives rise, when tasted, to the same burning sensation in the throat as is alleged with regard to antimony.

Do you know whether it gives rise to a metallic taste?—I do not know. I have often taken bismuth, but never tasted it. I have taken a piece on my finger.

Have you ever had a case of poisoning from bismuth?—No.

Do you know that there are such cases?—I know there are such cases, but you would want an enormous quantity.

And do you know that you can get diarrhœa and vomiting from an overdose of bismuth?—Yes.

And might you get spasms in the arms and legs?—Yes.

Would you get inflammation of the throat, windpipe, and gullet?—I do not know if you would.

In what quantity did you prescribe ipecacuanha?—In 3-minim doses.

How many would you say would give rise to a sense of sickness?—I should say about 60 minims.

Have you ever known 10 or 12 minims doing so?—No. The ordinary dose goes up to 10. Some people are more sensitive than others.

Did you keep any record of the medicine you prescribed?—I did not; I never do, except with a patient coming into the surgery.

And do you enter in a book the medicines you send out?—No, I put down the visits I make.

Is it not unusual to have no record?—No.

Are you certain as to what you gave the deceased?—I am almost certain that my memory is accurate as to what I gave the deceased.

Where did the beef suppositories come from?—They came from Burroughs & Wellcome.

And did you say anything to the deceased with regard to the injection of the suppositories?—No; there was never any conversation as to who was to inject them. The patient generally gets the nurse, and the accused had no objection to having one.

Dr James M. Stoker

Did you know what Toon's experience was?—I did not.

Did you not think it necessary to satisfy yourself that she could carry out your instructions?—I thought the accused would get a good nurse, because he knew what had to be done.

Should you not, as a rule, witness the injection?—No.

It was the accused who asked you to call and see the deceased?—Yes.

Did you suggest to him during the last twelve days that he should call in another doctor?—No.

Did you know Dr. Grapel?—No.

Was the accused present at your consultation?—No.

When did you first meet the accused?—I think I first met him in January, 1901, in connection with Bessie Taylor, who at that time was living with him as Mrs. Chapman.

And were you in consultation with three or four other medical men in connection with that matter, with the accused's consent and approval?—Yes; he paid the fees.

Were you under the impression that any suggestions you made with regard to food were carried out?—Yes.

And did the accused appear to be kind and solicitous to his wife?—Yes.

And did she appear to be fond of him?—Yes. I never had the slightest idea of anything being wrong.

Were the vomit and diarrhœa consistent with your experience of gastro-enteritis?—Yes.

And would you have been perfectly ready to give a certificate to that effect?—Yes.

Re-examined—Did you not think of submitting the vomit to chemical analysis because suspicion was entirely eliminated from your mind?—Yes; I had no idea of any irritant poison, and it would not have been possible for me to recognise antimony when examining the body.

It would have to be submitted to a chemical analysis, or to somebody with more experience than you have?—Yes.

Have you ever seen a case of poisoning by bismuth?—No, but I have read of one. There has not been a case in recent years. The number of grains in the case I read of was very great, and at that time bismuth had arsenic in it.

Was the bismuth in your surgery found to be perfectly pure?—Yes.

What is a medium dose?—A 5-grain dose of bismuth is a medium one. I was prescribing that with the view to allay the vomiting.

Is that a well-known remedy for doing that?—Yes.

Have you ever heard of these small doses causing vomiting or irritation?—No; it always has the opposite tendency.

How much bismuth do you use in your practice?—I use about half a pound in a fortnight.

Did you know whether your instructions as to diet were carried out or not?—No.

By Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—You know that Bessie Taylor died at the Monument?—Yes.

Were her symptoms something similar to those of Maud Marsh?—Yes.

And even that did not make you think that you ought to make further inquiry into this case?—No, not until after death.

By a JURYMAN—When you asked the accused to keep the vomit were your suspicions not aroused?—No, but I wanted to see the colour of it. I should not have given a certificate of death had not Dr. Grapel been called in, and she could not be buried without one.

By Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—Did you know that the accused and Maud March were not married?—Yes.

And did you know that he had no authority to forbid her father and mother having a post-mortem?—Yes.

Did the mother know that they were not married?—No, and I did not like to tell her so.

Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—I think it was the duty of the doctor to have told Mrs. Marsh, after her daughter's death, that he knew the accused was not her husband.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL—Does your lordship not think the doctor was placed in a rather difficult position?

Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—Certainly not. The doctor ought always to let the parents know the true position of affairs.

RICHARD BODMER, examined—I am a fellow of the Institute of Chemists, and am public analyst for the burgh of Bermondsey. I am also consulting chemist to the Clinical Research Association, 1 Southwark Street. I received two sealed jars from Dr. Stoker, one of them con-

Richard Bodmer

taining a human stomach and a small piece of human liver, the other containing a lower part of the bowel and some pieces of liver. I had a conversation with Dr. Stoker, and in consequence I applied some tests in order to discover whether there was any arsenic present. The stomach was tied at both ends, and on opening it I found its contents were from about $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{3}{4}$ ounces of a yellow gruel-like fluid. I applied Reinsch's test to a small portion of it. That is a well-known test for arsenic. I discovered arsenic was present. Some slips of copper are used in the test. They became a purple colour, indicating the probable presence of antimony in addition to arsenic. I communicated what I found to Dr. Stoker. On Monday, 27th October, Inspector Godley saw me, and in consequence I subjected another portion of the contents of the stomach to Marsh's test, which is also a test for arsenic and antimony. I discovered both present by that test, and also found that there was far more antimony present than arsenic. I did not open the second jar. I replaced the stomach in the first one, and a part of it which I had used in my tests I placed in a perfectly clean glass-stoppered bottle, and on 28th October I handed all three jars to the coroner's officer.

Cross-examined—What did the violet deposit suggest to you?—It suggested antimony.

Is it always a conclusive proof of its existence?—Not always. Other substances will hardly produce the same colour, but something which might be taken for it.

Have you read a report of *Pritchard's* case* in 1865?—No.

Can you give us any other substance which would produce the same violet colour?—I cannot at present remember any other substance, but sometimes arsenic will come out and almost look like antimony.

Do you rely only on the colour of the copper?—No.

Did you subject the copper to a cleansing process before using it?—I did.

Frank Lovell Gilbert, examined—I live at 9 King's Place, Borough High Street. In October I was mortuary keeper at Collier's Rents, Southwark. On 22nd October, just

* "Trial of Dr. Pritchard," edited by William Roughead.

before midnight, I saw Dr. Stoker, and in consequence of what he said I went to the Crown. I saw the accused, and asked him if he was Chapman. He said, "Yes." I told him I had been sent by Dr. Stoker to remove the body to the mortuary. He said he required it removed that night, but I said it was rather late. Having paid a visit to the undertaker, the removal was arranged for 5 a.m. the next day. The accused went to the mortuary with me then. We got there about 5.55. After we had taken the body from the shell I asked him who she was, and he said, "Maud Marsh, my wife." I asked him her age, and he said "twenty." A post-mortem was held that evening, Dr. Cotter, Dr. Stoker, and Dr. French being present. Parts of the body were placed in two jars, which were sealed up in my presence, and taken away by Dr. Stoker. I afterwards put the body back in the shell. On 25th October I again saw the accused at the Crown. He asked me if the funeral could start from the mortuary at 9 a.m. on the Monday; he said he had a business in the High Street, and he did not want any fuss outside the Crown. I told him he had better see the undertaker and arrange with him.

Cross-examined—Did you know he kept a public-house?—Yes.

Did the accused put any obstacle in your way to prevent your taking the body away?—No.

Joseph Henry Vaughan Marks, examined—I live at 31 Gaywood Street, and am coroner's officer for Southwark. On 25th October I received some information in consequence of which I went to the police station. An inquest was opened on the body of Maud Marsh on 28th October. That evening, by the coroner's order, I went to Mr. Bodmer, and received from him three jars. I took them to my house and kept them there till 30th October, when I gave them in the same state to Dr. Stevenson.

Dr. Thomas Stevenson, examined—I am an M.D., and I am one of the official analysts to the Home Office. I am also lecturer on forensic medicine at Guy's Hospital. I have had experience in analysis, particularly with reference to poisons, and have acted for the Home Office for

Dr Thomas Stevenson

thirty-one years. On 30th October I attended St. George's mortuary to make a post-mortem examination on the body of Maud Marsh. Dr. Freyberger, Dr. Stoker, and Dr. Cotter were there. There had been a previous post-mortem. The body had been dead fully eight days, but there was not much decomposition, much less than I should expect in a body so long dead, considering the time and season. The scalp covering the skull was dry. That indicated that there was little fluid in the tissues. The skull and brain were normal; there was no hæmorrhage or disease in the brain. The spinal cord was normal, and there was no sign of disease there. The tongue was yellow, coated, and swollen. The air passages of the lungs were quite clear, and the lungs free from disease. There was a good deal of fat about the heart, but that would not have affected her health much unless it had gone much further. It invaded the muscles to the extent of about one-third. The mesenteric glands were much swollen. The stomach had been taken away, but it was given to me by the coroner's officer before the end of the post-mortem. The blood vessels of the bowels were unusually red and injected with blood, but not to a very marked extent. The mucous membrane of the bowels was swollen and slimy, and was in the condition which we usually know as sub-acute enteritis, which is inflammation of the membrane lining the bowels. There was a good deal of liquid in the bowels, but only a little semi-solid fæcal matter, which was about the sigmoid flexure of the colon. One of the glands showed that she had probably been a person subjected to habitual constipation. The whole of the rectum had been removed. I found no ulceration of the bowels. I examined the pancreas, the spleen, and the kidneys. They were all sound and healthy. The liver had been detached, but it was in the abdomen. A small portion had been removed. It was rather dry and greasy, but there was no condition which would affect her health materially.

I examined the womb and ovaries. They were perfectly normal. She had never apparently borne a child, nor were there any signs that she had been far advanced in pregnancy. Menstruation was just upon ceasing. I found no evidence of any natural disease which would account for her death.

I suspected that she had died from some form of irritant poison, which had set up enteritis. I had heard of the question of arsenical poisoning, but I came to the conclusion on making the examination that it was not arsenic, but some other metallic poison. I then removed the brain, some blood from the cavity of the chest, the spleen, the gall bladder, which was full of bile, the liver, the kidneys, the contents of the bowels, the bowels themselves, and also some blood from the abdominal cavity. They were all rather light in weight. The drain on the fluid caused by vomiting would account for that in a great measure.

On the 31st I examined the stomach from the jar. There were signs of putrefaction externally, and internally it was pink and injected with blood. The blood vessels were prominent and redder than usual. Internally it was coated with a good deal of yellow, slimy mucus, which became an orange colour at the bowel end. I did not find any ulcers or loss of substance. I examined the contents in the stomach and portion of the liver and rectum in the jars.

I made an analysis of various parts of the body. Every portion of the body which I examined had antimony in it. I found antimony in the stomach and its contents, in the bowels and their contents, in the liver, bile, spleen, kidneys, the fluid which I took from the abdominal cavity, the blood from the cavity of the chest, and in the brain. I made tests for arsenical poisoning. I found traces of arsenic in a small quantity, and I formed the opinion that death had not resulted from it. Arsenic is sometimes found in antimony when it is impure. I came to the conclusion that death was caused by poisoning with antimony in a soluble form—tartar-emetic or metallic antimony. That is one of the scheduled poisons.

I did not find any bismuth, but the tests for bismuth are not so complete. If there was any it must have been infinitesimal. I have never heard in late years of a case where bismuth has caused such symptoms as these, or caused death. Bismuth is now purified from arsenic and other impurities. Five grains is an ordinary dose. In the cases I have heard of where death was caused by bismuth I think that 120 grains must have been taken. I found no trace of

impure bismuth in this case. I found 0.32 of a grain of metallic antimony in the contents of the stomach and 5.99 grains in the contents of the bowels. That indicated to me that there must have been a large dose of antimony given within a few hours of death, as it is soluble in water. It had not been got rid of by purging or vomiting. In the liver I found 0.71 of a grain of metallic antimony, in the kidneys 0.14 of a grain, in the brain 0.17 of a grain—in all I found 7.24 grains, the bulk of which was in the bowel. I deduce from that there was a good deal more antimony in the body. Antimony can be made soluble in the form of tartar-emetic or emetic-tartar, which is a white powder, soluble in water. It does not change the appearance of the water. Emetic-tartar is not altogether antimony. 7.24 grains of metallic antimony would represent 20.12 grains of tartar-emetic, the proportion being, roughly, three to one.

I did not calculate the amount of tartar-emetic in the whole body, but from my experience I should put it at between 25 and 30 grains. When tartar-emetic or antimony is administered, as a rule the greater part of it is very quickly ejected; purging relieves it. The effect of the poison itself generally takes a very considerable time before it causes death. Death has occurred in many cases where it was given in repeated moderate doses. Vomiting and purging make people waste away. It produces gastro-enteritis, and they also appear to die from failure of the heart. Antimony depresses the circulation and quickens the pulse, but gives it a very feeble power. Two grains of tartar-emetic have killed, but that is not ordinary. I should put the ordinary fatal dose at probably 15 grains; others put it at 10, and even that might not be fatal if the greater portion of it is vomited.*

People have taken tartar-emetic in much larger quantities and have recovered where it has been quickly vomited. I am of opinion that if 2 or 3 grains were given repeatedly to a healthy person it would eventually cause death. When doses of antimony are given from time to time the symp-

* "Ten grains have killed a boy of five, and a like quantity a girl of three. At the same time recovery has followed doses of 60, 170, and over 400 grains respectively."— Glaister's "Medical Jurisprudence," p. 691.

toms are great depression, profuse perspiration, followed by neausea and vomiting. Purging is set up with pain in the abdomen, and usually after a time there is a burning or metallic sensation in the throat and stomach; there is a great thirst. Spasms are quite common, and patients fall sometimes into a comatose or semi-comatose state. They are generally very pallid, and sometimes they get quite jaundiced and dark under the eyes, and thin and worn. It is sometimes the appearance, apart from other symptoms, which indicates that the patient is approaching death. In the case of Mr. Braywood, it was his appearance which excited the suspicion that he would die. Sir William Gull and others who saw him, although he was apparently going on well, thought afterwards he could not get on so well. That was a case of poisoning by tartar-emetic.

If tartar-emetic is taken in a strong solution it has a somewhat metallic, but sweetish taste, but when taken diluted it does not have much taste. It can be covered up by food or medicine. People take antimony wine, which is sherry with antimony in it, and yet not know that anything is wrong. If doses had been going on for some time so as to set up irritation of the mucous membrane, that would set up the burning feeling in the throat. Antimony can be dissolved and given by injections, or put into injections. That would be very dangerous; it would be quickly absorbed into the rectum and then into the body. The vomit in a case of poisoning by antimony would be at first the contents of the stomach, and then it would become green or yellow.

I got a great number of bottles from Sergeant Kemp. I examined them. There was antimony or arsenic in one of them. Some of them had contained photographic chemicals. I examined the bismuth powders found in the room, proved to have come from Dr. Stoker. They were free from antimony and arsenic. I also examined the bismuth from Dr. Stoker's surgery. It was pure and a very good specimen. The two bottles which contained medicine had no trace of antimony or arsenic. The other one had two or three drops at the bottom of it. I do not know if it had been washed out. I found bismuth and antimony in it. I

should say there was quite as much antimony as bismuth in it. There was enough antimony to give several full doses. Tartar-emetic can be dissolved in water, so as not to be apparent, and this could be mixed with a bismuth preparation. It is also soluble in brandy; brandy of ordinary strength will take up about 2 grains to the ounce. A tablespoonful of such medicine would be a full emetic dose. It is much more soluble in brandy and water than in plain brandy. These two bottles contain brandy and water, two parts water and one part brandy. There is tartar-emetic in one of them. This one, which contains about an ounce, is probably a fatal dose. I could find nothing to account for death except poisoning by antimony. Antimony might be given to produce perspiration and for bad colds, but only from one-twenty-fourth to one-twenty-sixth of a grain to a dose. Half a grain to a grain would be an emetic. Death would not ensue from one dose of that strength or cause great pain. If vomited, it would not produce diarrhœa. All the signs I found at the post-mortem would not be caused by such doses as that.

By Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—When I said I could find nothing to account for death except poisoning by antimony, I meant antimony administered for the purpose of poisoning.

Cross-examined—Is there enough antimony left in this bottle for a fatal dose?—No, but if the bottle had been full of the same preparation of bismuth, antimony, and water, I think there would have been sufficient for a fatal dose, but I am not positive.

How many doses did it contain?—Six doses. Each dose of itself would not be a fatal one, but I cannot say what would be the effect of six successive doses. I should expect a person to be very ill after taking them.

Did you examine the syringes?—Yes.

Is one of them covered with an insoluble preparation of antimony, which is used in its manufacture?—Yes. Apart from that, I did not find any trace of antimony on either of them.

Did you hear that they were used for the injecting of

liquid beef tea?—Yes, and also that they were soaked and washed afterwards.

What was the immediate cause of death?—Acute gastritis. I have had to do with a good many cases, but I never saw such extensive gastro-enteritis from ptomaine poisoning.

Does it generally produce more inflammation of the bowels than of the stomach?—Yes, and in this case the stomach was worse than the bowels.

Do persons who have died from ptomaine poisoning suffer from sub-acute enteritis?—Yes; it is a question of degree.

The fat which you noticed round the heart might point to old alcoholism?—Yes, but fatty degeneration of the heart is well known in poisoning, and the deceased was a very young woman to have had a fatty heart from alcoholism.

Is tartar-emetic sometimes used as a check to drinking propensities?—Yes; it nauseates the patient so that he cannot indulge in drink for the time being.

Does bismuth contain impurities which might give rise to arsenical poisoning?—In former times bismuth contained impurities which, apart from the bismuth itself, gave rise to arsenical poisoning, but at the present day bismuth is cleansed from these impurities and is not itself poisonous.

Have there been cases on record of bismuth poisoning where the dose was only 2 drachms?—Yes.

Have you edited Taylor's "Medical Jurisprudence"?—Yes.

Would a metallic taste, vomiting and purging, spasms in the arms and legs, which occurred in a case of bismuth poisoning, coincide with a case of poisoning by antimony?—Yes, but in a paragraph in my edition of Taylor I think that that is explained.

What was your reason for saying you did not attribute the poisoning to arsenic?—Because the quantity of arsenic was very small, and it was present only in the contents of the stomach and bowel, and in the liver, but I could not detect any in the more remote organs, and if a person died from arsenical poisoning I should expect to find arsenic generally distributed through the body. There was not sufficient arsenic to make me attach any importance to it.

How do you ascertain its presence?—In various ways.

Dr Thomas Stevenson

The colour of the copper foil in Reinsch's test is very significant.

Do arsenic, antimony, bismuth, and mercury give very much the same colour?—Yes, but none of them gives the particular effect of antimony so far as I know, and, of course, one does not rely on that one simple test alone. My tests are absolute and not only probable. I discovered some sulphide, which was soluble in hydro-chloride acid, and separating and treating it by Marsh's process it was proved over and over again beyond all doubt to be antimony. That colour is not common to other mineral or vegetable poisons. Putrefaction had only just commenced on the body of the deceased at the time of her death. There was only one day when the temperature rose above 50 degrees. I keep a record. I was engaged in the Bravo case, which was a case of poisoning by tartar-emetic.

Did you see the vomit in that case?—No, but probably it contained blood. The purge contained blood, but it is not invariably present in the vomit and purge in cases of antimonial poisoning.

Have you personally had a case where a person who died of antimonial poisoning vomited or purged blood?—No. Bravo passed blood the same night that he had the antimony. I was at the inquest in that case. There are cases where there has been no vomiting of blood.

Re-examined—The question of blood in the stool would be according to the amount of irritation, and in the fæces the blood might not appear as blood, but as a black stuff?—Yes, to an unskilled person it might not appear to be blood, but if the motion was black it would probably indicate that there was blood.

If you as a medical man wished to know whether there was metallic poison, would you look to see if there was blood in the fæcal matter?—Yes.

Do the glass tubes which you produce contain antimony in a sulphide form which you took from the deceased's body?—Yes.

All the bismuth that came from Dr. Stoker was pure?—Yes, and did not contain arsenic.

And have you any reason to think the deceased was addicted to drink?—No; I never heard it suggested until now.

Dr Thomas Stevenson

Was there anything in the fatty degeneration of the heart that would cause death?—No. I daresay I have a much fatter heart than she had.

Would it not have produced vomiting or gastro-enteritis?—No.

Could ptomaine poisoning possibly bring about the production of antimony by any internal process?—No.

And if the syringes were soaked in water, that would get rid of any traces of antimony?—Yes.

There would be no difficulty in mixing the antimony with bismuth if you dissolved it in water first?—No.

You could also put it into the bismuth without dissolving it?—Yes.

By Mr. Elliott—Does bismuth taken by the patient produce black motions?—Yes.

By a Juryman—Was there less antimony in the rectum than higher up in the bowel?—Yes.

Can you say if the whole of the last dose of antimony was due to rectum administration?—I cannot say, but I think that she must have had during the last few hours of her life some given by the mouth. If the brandy was pure it would not take up enough antimony to give it any extra taste, but I should not like to take a mouthful of this brandy and water and antimony.

Richard Bodmer (recalled), examined—Did you take part with Dr. Stevenson in the chemical analysis of the different parts of the deceased's body?—I did. I have been in Court while he has been giving evidence, and I agree with him absolutely.

Dr. Ludwig Freyberger, examined—I am an M.D. and M.R.C.P. I was present on 30th October at the post-mortem conducted by Dr. Stevenson. I have heard him describe the various organs of the deceased's body, and I agree with his evidence. I took no part in the chemical analysis.

George Godley (recalled), examined—I found the bottle which Dr. Stevenson has referred to. Nos. 2, 3, and 4 I found in the deceased's bedroom. I took them to my office and handed them over to Sergeant Kemp, with instructions what to do.

Cross-examined—I took everything that was there.

Mrs Eliza Marsh

Mrs. Eliza Marsh (recalled), examined—The deceased lived with me until she was fifteen or sixteen. She was afterwards in one or two situations as a housemaid. After she left them, and until she went to the Monument, she lived with me again. She was sober and temperate, and never in the slightest degree addicted to drinking habits.

William Wenzel, examined—I am a hairdresser at 7 Church Lane, Leytonstone. I have been there about eighteen years. About 1896 I advertised for an assistant, and the accused came to me and remained about six or seven months. I knew him as George Chapman. He said he had come from Tottenham, where he had a shop which was unsuccessful, so he could not give me references.

Cross-examined—Did you know him under any other name?—No.

Had you sometimes men calling on you with hairdressers' sundries?—Yes. I do not think any one called while the accused was with me, but I am not sure.

Joseph Smith Renton, examined—I am a corn chandler at 460 High Road, Leytonstone. My family originally lived in Yorkshire. I went to Leytonstone in 1881 or 1882. I am now about forty-one years old. I had a cousin named Mary Isabella Renton. If she had been alive now she would have been six or seven years older than I am. She came to live with me at Leytonstone, and finally married Shadrach Spink, a porter at Leytonstone Station. They had two boys named Shadrach and William. William was not born until a few months after Spink left his wife. He took Shadrach with him. Some time after he went away I noticed that my cousin was keeping company with the accused, whom I knew as Chapman, and who was employed at Wenzel's. About March, 1896, my cousin left Leytonstone. I was given to understand she was married to Chapman, as she passed as Mrs. Chapman. I saw her again in June, 1896. I first heard of her death in 1898 from a representative of Dr. Barnardo's Homes.

Cross-examined—Did you ever speak to the accused?—Never in my life.

Did you ever know him under any other name than Chapman?—No.

Was he in Wenzel's shop all the time you knew him?—Yes.

Do you know if he and your cousin were on good terms?—No; I did not see sufficient of them.

JOHN WARD, examined—I live at Ilford; I used to live at Leytonstone. I knew a man there named Shadrach Spink. He was a railway porter. I knew his wife, Isabella Spink, and also Wenzel's shop. I went to Wenzel's shop sometimes, and I made the accused's acquaintance. He came to me once and asked me to let him a furnished room, which I did. After he had been in my house some time my wife spoke to me, and I told the accused that my wife did not like the carrying on between him and Mrs. Spink. He said, "It is all right; we are going to get married on Sunday week." I found him kissing her on the stairs. That was in October, 1895. Early one Sunday morning Mrs. Spink and the accused went out and came back about 10 a.m. She had been living at my house before the accused had. The accused said, "Mr. and Mrs. Ward, allow me to introduce you to my wife, Mrs. Chapman." They said they had been married somewhere in the city, at a Catholic place. My wife said, "Where is the certificate?" He said, "Oh, our laws are different to your laws"—or something to that effect. He said he was a Polish Jew. They stayed at my house for some little time, and then went to Hastings.

Cross-examined—Did you know the accused under any other name?—No.

Had you never heard Mrs. Spink call him any other name?—No.

By Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—Did Mrs. Spink take drink?—When she had her money she used to take a drop of drink, but she was not a habitual drunkard.

ARTHUR NEIL, examined—I am a detective sergeant. I searched the register of marriages at Somerset House from the beginning of 1895 to 1897, and I found no record of any marriage between any one named George Chapman and Mary Isabella Spink, or between Severin Klosowski and Mary Isabella Spink, or between Klosowski and anybody else.

Mrs. ANNIE HELSDOWN, examined—I am the wife of

Mrs Annie Helsdown

Frederick Helsdown, and I live at Hastings. For some years we lived at 10 Hill Street, and I remember a Mr. and Mrs. Chapman, and a little boy named Willie, coming to live in the house. The accused is Mr. Chapman. I did not know him before that. The boy was about five or six. After they had been there some time the accused opened a barber's shop in George Street. He and his wife had their meals there. I think she assisted in the shop. I heard her cry out once or twice, and I went to her next morning and she showed me a mark on her throat. She made a communication to me. She was not so well during the latter part of the time as she was at first. She was sick, and said she had dreadful pains in her stomach. That was in 1896. I saw her vomit; it was greenish. No doctor was attending her. I left them there in 1897.

Cross-examined—Was it genearally early in the morning that she was sick?—Yes.

Mrs. Harriet Greenaway, examined—I am the wife of Frank Greenaway, of 14 Braybrook Road, Hastings. Up to 22nd March, 1897, I lived at 1 Coburg Place. A family named Chapman came to live in the same house about a month before I left. There was a man, a woman, and a child. The accused is the man. He went to a hairdresser's shop in George Street. He said he was a Russian Pole, and that he had been in America. He once wrote down a name and said it was his name in Russian. I had some volumes of "Cassell's Family Physician" which I gave to Mrs. Chapman to keep for a time. I never got them back. I identify the volumes produced as the volumes I lent to Mrs. Chapman.

Cross-examined—Did you have much to do with Mrs. Chapman?—No, but I saw her every day.

Did you think she was given to drink?—Yes.

Did you see any unpleasantness between her and the accused?—No.

Did she tell you she had been married before?—Yes.

Did she tell you whether she was married to the accused or not?—I cannot say if she told me whether she was married to the accused or not. I thought that she was his wife. She said her first husband had been killed on the railway.

Mrs Harriet Greenaway

When the accused wrote his name in Russian did you understand it?—No.

Mrs. Martha Doubleday, examined—I am married, and I live at Richmond Street, Bartholomew Square, St. Luke's. I have known the Prince of Wales beer-house in Bartholomew Square for some years. In the autumn of 1897 the accused became a tenant there. I knew him as Chapman. There was a woman with him, whom I knew as Mrs. Chapman. Her name had been Mary Isabella Spink. She was a nice, little-built person, with a fresh colour. I became friendly with her. After they had been in the house about twelve months I noticed that she was white, and she got very thin. She said she had pains all over her, and she seemed to be getting worse.

The accused came to me a fortnight before Christmas and asked me if I would go over and sit up with his wife at night, as she was very ill. I said I would, and I went up to see her. There was no doctor there. I asked if I would fetch a doctor. The accused said, "Who is the nearest?" I said, "Dr. Rogers." He gave me a paper, and Dr. Rogers came. I stayed with Mrs. Chapman every night. She was in bed in the front room on the second floor. The accused lay on the couch. I was locked in. Mrs. Chapman was in bed all the time I was there. She was suffering very much. She vomited, and had pains all over her. She vomited frequently, and it was dark brown. I gave her nothing at all during the night. After the doctor came the accused gave her brandy and medicine. He brought the brandy up with him at night and put it on the table. After she had the brandy she vomited. I was only there at night. I saw Mrs. Mumford there during the day. Mrs. Chapman had diarrhœa very badly. I had to get her out of bed. Dr. Rogers asked me to go and get Mrs. Waymark to nurse her, as I could not do it any longer. I did not find out what was the matter with Mrs. Chapman. I did not ask the accused what was the matter with her.

Towards Christmas she got much worse. The vomiting continued. At night she had only medicine and brandy. She complained of being thirsty. She asked for drink, and

Mrs Martha Doubleday

the accused brought it up. During the last few days Mrs. Waymark gave her some Liebig. That did not come up. When the accused came into the room he used to lean over her. Once or twice he told me to go outside, and then I would hear her say, "Pray God, go away from me." I did not afterwards ask her or the accused what she meant by that.

On Christmas morning she got much worse and became unconscious. She had been vomiting very much. A severe flooding came on. I called out for the accused, but he did not come up for some time afterwards. When he did come he only leant over the bed and then went into the next room. Before she died I called him again, and he leant over her and said, "Polly, Polly, speak!" She had just died then. He went into the next room and cried. I called him because she was dying. He did not come at once. When he did come she was gone. He went down and opened the house. She died at one o'clock. I said, "You are never going to open the house to-day?" He said, "Yes, I am."

I saw Mrs. Chapman's body after she was dead. It was in a very shocking condition; it was very much bruised. There were signs of the flooding; it looked as if it was wrapped up in a sheet. The boy was in the next room when she died. She was buried on the following Thursday in St. Patrick's Cemetery, Leytonstone. The accused continued to carry on the house. I never ascertained what the deceased died of. Dr. Rogers, who is now dead, gave the certificate.

Cross-examined—Did you see Dr. Rogers very often?—No.

Were you a customer at the beer-house?—I was not a customer at the beer-house until about six months after the accused took it.

And at that time Mrs. Chapman was a very healthy woman?—Yes.

Did you know that she was suffering in any way?—No.

Did she not say that she had been ill at Hastings?—No, neither did the accused. The first symptoms that I noticed of her becoming ill were that she began to get thin.

PUTNEY,

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Martha Doubleday

Did the accused know that you were a great friend of his wife?—Yes. It was through me that he had a doctor.

Did Dr. Rogers come regularly?—Yes.

Did he prescribe medicine?—Yes.

Was anything recommended in the way of nourishment by Dr. Rogers until Mrs. Waymark came?—No.

Did you know Mrs. Waymark?—I did not know her then.

What did she do when she came?—She washed Mrs. Chapman all over and put on her a clean chemise and nightgown, which I bought for her.

Was the nourishment that Dr. Rogers ordered obtained?—Yes, and everything he suggested was done.

Did the accused appear to be anxious to do everything he could?—Yes.

What had you to drink while you were in the house?—The only thing I had to drink while I was in the house was a drop of stout, which the accused brought up to me. I did not taste the brandy.

Did you drink the stout?—I did not drink the stout, because I did not care for it.

Did you have much to say to the accused?—No.

Dr. Rogers saw Mrs. Chapman before she was dead?—Yes.

And was he a man of great experience?—Yes.

Mrs. Jane Mumford, examined—I live at 74 Bath Street, St. Luke's. In 1897 I was living at 19 Bartholomew Square. I knew the Chapmans when they came to the Prince of Wales. Mrs. Chapman seemed very well indeed at first. In the autumn I saw her in bed, and I relieved Mrs. Doubleday in the night nursing. The accused was in the room during the night—locked in. I did not see Mrs. Chapman have any nourishment at night. She had some medicine given to her by the accused, but I cannot say what it was. She always complained of thirst, but I do not know what she had when she was thirsty; the accused would never let me see it. She asked for a "pony" of stout, and accused went down and got it. She suffered from sickness and diarrhœa very much. The accused gave her something in a wineglass, but I could not see the colour of it. I suppose he got it from the medicine bottle that was kept on the sideboard. After she drank what he gave

Mrs Jane Mumford

her she was generally sick. A utensil was kept there, but I never emptied it or saw it done. The accused said that Mrs. Chapman was suffering from *delirium tremens* through drink. I saw him reading books in the bar. He said they were doctors' books, and that he was giving her stuff to cure her of *delirium tremens*. I said, "She seems very bad," and he said, "Oh, she will get better when she gets on." He said he had been a bit of a doctor. I did not know what he meant. I had very little to say to him. I was not present when Mrs Chapman died. I attended her until some three or four days before her death.

Cross-examined—Have you had any experience of nursing?—No; I only went there out of kindness. During the last week I was there, I was there all day and two nights.

Were you paid?—No.

Was there anybody else in the house besides the accused and yourself?—No.

Did Dr. Rogers come once a day?—Yes.

Where did the medicine stand?—On the sideboard.

And anybody could have examined the bottles if they wished?—Yes.

Did the accused appear attentive and fond of the deceased?—Yes.

And did she seem fond of him?—Yes.

Did you speak to Dr. Rogers?—No, I only knew him by sight.

Was he well known in the neighbourhood?—Yes, he was well known in the neighbourhood as a very good doctor.

As far as you knew, did Mrs. Chapman have the medicine he ordered?—Yes.

Did he bring the medicine with him?—Sometimes he brought it, and sometimes I called for it.

Did the accused take the medicine from the bottles Dr. Rogers sent?—Yes, I never saw him change it.

Did you give her any food?—No.

Do you know what the doctor ordered her to eat?—No.

Mrs. Elizabeth Waymark, examined—I live at 41 Windsor Terrace, City Road. I go out nursing sometimes. I knew the late Dr. Rogers, of Old Street. Towards the end of 1897 he sent me to the Prince of Wales to nurse Mrs.

Mr. George Elliott.

(*Photo. by Elliott & Fry.*)

Mrs Elizabeth Waymark

Chapman for about a fortnight before her death. I saw the accused and made arrangements with him for the nursing. He said she was wasting away, but he did not say what was the matter with her. I saw her in bed. She complained of diarrhœa and vomiting, and violent pains in her stomach. I very often saw her vomit. It was slimy and green, and as she vomited she was purged; she had diarrhœa. She did not take much food, only a little beef tea, brandy, milk and soda, and water. The accused generally gave them to her. I do not know whether the milk was mixed with water or soda. After she had had the drink she was sick, and then she used to go off in a stupor. She gradually grew worse. When the accused came into the room he would go to the bedside and feel her pulse. I told him that she was very bad, and I asked him what was the matter, but he did not make any answer. He said he knew. I was with her when she died. Just before the end she had a severe flooding. Once I felt her pulse and it was very low; I could scarcely feel it.

When I saw that she was dying I sent down two or three times for the accused. At first he did not come up, and when he did she said to him, "Do kiss me." She put her arms out for him to bend over to kiss her, but he did not do so. The last time I sent for him just before she died he did not come up in time. I prepared the body for burial. It was a mere skeleton. She died on Christmas Day, 1897. I did not go to the funeral. On 9th December, 1902, I went to St. Patrick's Cemetery, Leytonstone, where I had heard that she was buried, and I saw Dr. Stevenson there. I did not see the coffin taken up, but I saw the body in the coffin in a little shed. I recognised it as the body of the woman I saw on Christmas Day, 1897. I had no difficulty in recognising it. It was in a good state of preservation. I never heard from Dr. Rogers what she died of, and I do not know.

By Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—What was the appearance of the body when you saw it after it had been exhumed?—When she was exhumed she looked as if she had only been buried about nine months. The only difference was that her hair had grown a little longer on the forehead. The face was perfect.

Mrs Elizabeth Waymark

Cross-examined—Have you often nursed under Dr. Rogers?—Yes.

Had you known him for a long time?—Yes.

He was a very experienced and clever doctor?—Yes.

Was it through him that you went there?—Yes. I had not seen the Chapmans before that.

Was everything done for Mrs. Chapman that possibly could be done?—I did everything that I possibly could for her, and as far as I can tell she had everything that Dr. Rogers ordered.

Was she in a dying state when you went there?—Yes; I knew she was past help when I got there. When Dr. Rogers came I said, "She is in a very bad state," and he said "Yes."

Did he say what she was suffering from?—No.

Were you there when he gave the certificate?—No.

Do you remember another doctor being called in just before she died?—No.

Henry Edward Pierce, examined—I am an undertaker at 27 Featherstone Street. On the evening of Christmas Day, 1897, I was called to the Prince of Wales, where I saw the accused, and he made arrangements with me for the interment and funeral of Mary Isabella Chapman, whom he described as his wife. He said he wanted the coffin the same night, and I said it was impossible, but I promised it next day at twelve. I went up and saw the body. It was very yellow, and it struck me as unusual. I took particulars for a nameplate, which was prepared. It had on it, "Mary Isabella Chapman, aged 41 years, died December 25th, 1897." The funeral and interment took place at St. Patrick's Cemetery, Leytonstone, on 30th December. I was present. On 9th December, 1902, I saw taken from the same grave the same coffin with the nameplate on it. I removed the lid and recognised the body inside.

Cross-examined—Did you see the certificate given by Dr. Rogers?—No; we only require to have the register of death and an order for burial.

The accused did not give you any other particulars about Mrs. Chapman?—No.

Re-examined—I show you a receipted bill. Is that the receipted bill for the funeral?—Yes.

George Godley (recalled), examined—(Shown undertaker's bill)—I found this undertaker's bill at the Crown. I also produce the certificate of the registration of the death of Mary Isabella Chapman on 25th December, 1897. The cause of death is certified by Dr. Rogers to be phthisis.

Dr. Thomas Stevenson (recalled), examined—I attended at St. Patrick's Cemetery, Leytonstone, on 9th December, 1902, and examined the body in the coffin bearing the nameplate of Mary Isabella Chapman, who died on 25th December, 1897. I saw the lid removed. The body was altogether remarkable; the face and head were those of a woman who might have been coffined that day from the appearance. Even the eyes were unruptured, a very unusual circumstance. There was not the least difficulty in recognising her. The muscles had a fresh appearance. All the parts of the body cut rather leathery, like shoe leather, and, of course, were drier than in a fresh body. All the parts of the body except the brain were preserved. The stomach was unusually pink externally. That was from the blood in the vessels being more than usually good. Its inner coat was of a pecular cinnabar red colour, and towards the bowel end there was a patch of black blood which had been effused. There was no sign of perforation or ulceration, there was no loss of substance in the mucous membrane. Towards the bowel end there were some old scars of years' standing. The bowels were not ruptured. The tube was intact. Internally the bowel had the same red colour as the stomach. There was no ulceration. The liver was pale, but firm in texture and fairly normal. The spleen, the kidneys, the bladder, the heart, and the lungs were all normal.

There was no sign of phthisis; that generally indicates disease of the lungs. The cause of death was gastro-enteritis. There was no other cause. There was nothing to indicate that the woman had been a confirmed drunkard. If she had drunk it had not produced any serious injury

to the kidneys or liver. The inflammation which I found in the stomach was not attributable to alcohol.

I removed the stomach, bowels, liver, kidneys, spleen, lungs, heart, brain, and some of the muscles, and submitted them all to analysis, except the lungs. They all contained antimony. It had permeated to the muscle of the thigh. In the bowels I found 0.41 of a grain of metallic antimony, in the liver 0.87 of a grain, in the kidneys 0.06, and in the stomach 0.03, which makes altogether 1.37 grains. That would represent as emetic-tartar 3.83 grains. There was more in her liver than I found in Maud Marsh's. That quantity points to a large amount of antimony having been absorbed into the body, and would indicate a considerable dose having been taken some hours before death, or the continuous administration of small doses. The purging and vomiting would get rid of a good deal of the antimony.

I came to the conclusion that the cause of death was poisoning by antimony, and I attribute the preservation of the body to the antimony. It has not been thoroughly recognised that preservation is one of the effects of antimony, but it has been found in previous cases to be a preservative. The fact of antimony being found in the muscles would not indicate that doses of antimony had been going on for some time, because I think it would quickly pass to every vascular part of the body. I tested the earth round the coffin to see if it yielded any poison. Evidently the body had not been touched by water. The coffin and its contents were well preserved.

Cross-examined—Does the condition of preservation in a measure depend on the surroundings of the body, quite apart from anything internal?—Yes.

Was it an elm coffin?—Yes.

And was the grave 18 feet deep?—Yes.

Does the depth of the grave to some extent help to preserve the body?—Yes, but if this body had begun to decay at the time it was buried the depth of the grave would not have retarded it. The air generally reaches a body before it is buried.

This soil was very dry, clay and loam, which would assist preservation?—Yes.

It would take a few years for rain to get down 18 feet?—Yes.

The grave was not a brick one?—No.

There were seven other coffins above; this one was at the bottom?—Yes.

What was the appearance of the body?—The body was almost lifelike.

Have bodies buried in lead coffins, when opened years afterwards, been found to be preserved to a wonderful degree?—Yes, in those cases the air had been excluded. A wooden coffin would not be hermetically sealed. The other bodies removed from this grave had a fearful smell.

Did you open the other coffins?—No, they were reverently put aside and a tarpaulin put over them.

How long had they been buried?—The whole of them had been buried within a month.

Did you analyse the lungs?—No, because I was told the woman had died from phthisis, but when I found no traces I put them aside in case questions were asked.

If you had not known the history of the woman, and were told that a certificate of death from phthisis had been given, would you have found that consistent with her condition?—I might possibly have found that consistent with her condition.

When people die from phthisis there is generally great emaciation?—Yes.

By a Juryman—Would antimony given in gradual doses for a long time be more likely to preserve the body than a sudden dose?—I am of opinion that antimony given in gradual doses for a long time would be more likely to preserve the body than a sudden dose. It would get more into the system.

Richard Bodmer (recalled), examined—I took part with Dr. Stevenson in making an analysis of this body. I have heard his evidence, and I agree with it.

William Taylor, examined—I live at 62 Lausanne Road, Hornsey. Bessie Taylor was my sister. She was about thirty-six when she died. She had held the position of manageress in some places in London. Her last engagement was at Peckham, before being, as I understood, married.

William Taylor

About four years ago she introduced me to the accused as her husband. I cannot fix the date. I believe they were then living at the Prince of Wales. I afterwards learned that they had gone to Bishops Stortford, and afterwards I learned that they were living at the Monument. I did not know my sister had gone there as a barmaid. In December, 1900, I heard that she was ill, and my mother came up from Cheshire. I saw my mother, and after some conversation with her I went to see my sister at the Monument. I had not seen her for about three months, when she had called on me. She was apparently then in good health. I recognise the photograph now shown me as a photograph of my sister. She looked strong and healthy. When I saw her at the Monument she appeared to be very ill and shrunken; she had gone like a little old woman. She said she had violent pains in her inside, and that she had been very sick. The next I heard was a message from my mother that she had died on 13th February. On 15th February I met the accused at St. Pancras Station, and with him and other members of the family I went to Lymm Churchyard, in Cheshire, where my sister was buried. I was at the graveside in November, 1902, and saw her grave opened and the coffin in which she had been buried taken out.

Cross-examined—How often did you see the accused and your sister together?—About six times.

Did they seem to be on good terms?—Yes.

Did he treat her kindly and properly?—Yes.

Did she seem to be fond of him?—Yes, and they seemed to be happy.

Did he seem to be very sorry to have lost her when she died?—Yes, he behaved in every way that I should expect a man to who had just lost his wife.

Did you ever hear your sister make any complaint about him?—No.

Did you know Dr. Stoker attended to her at the Monument?—No.

Did you know that she was being attended by a doctor?—Yes.

Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Painter, examined—I live at 8 Argyll Street, Oxford Street, and I am a caretaker. I was

Mrs Elizabeth A. Painter

acquainted with Bessie Taylor for many years. I remember her being in a situation at Peckham. About Easter time, 1898, she left there and went to live at the Prince of Wales. I understood that she had been married. I visited her there and saw the accused. They were living as Mr. and Mrs. Chapman. She was in good health.

I next heard of them at the Grapes at Bishops Stortford. Shortly before Christmas, 1898, I went down there to stay for a week or two. Just before Christmas Bessie went into the local hospital. She had lumps on her face from her gums. She came out of the hospital in about a week, and returned to the Grapes. The accused was very unkind to her when she came back; he carried on at her all the afternoon, and in the evening he frightened her with a revolver, because he said she had been telling the customers that she was going into the hospital. She was not strong when she came out of the hospital, but she was better.

I next heard of them at the Monument. He was not kind to her there; he was always carrying on at her. She seemed to be fading very much. She complained of pains all over her, and her head was bad. She got very thin. Towards the end of 1900 I visited her every evening. She always felt sick, and it always came on after she had had anything to eat or drink. She was in bed, and had pains in her stomach. I do not know if she had diarrhœa. When the accused came into her room he felt her pulse with his watch in his hand. After a time I saw medicine bottles in the room. The accused would shake them and then look up to the light through them. I asked him what was the matter with her, and he said it was a complication of diseases. When I went into the bar I would ask him how Bessie was, and sometimes he would say, "Your friend is dead," but when I went upstairs I would find her alive. I saw her on 7th February. She seemed a bit brighter then. I went again on the 14th. I did not know she had died the day before. I saw the accused and asked him about Bessie. He said she was about the same. The nurse took me upstairs and told me something, and I found she was dead. The house was open when I went there.

Cross-examined—Were Bessie and you great friends?—Yes, we had been in service together.

Mrs Elizabeth A. Painter

Did you see her in the hospital at Bishops Stortford?—Yes.

Was there anything else the matter with her except her face?—No.

How long had she been at the Monument when you first noticed anything the matter with her?—I do not know. I think that when she came from Bishops Stortford her health began to fail. The first time I saw her in London I noticed that she was in ill-health.

What was the attitude of the accused towards you?—He was pretty fair with me. Most people are changeable, and he was no exception to the rule.

With the exception of his carrying on at Bessie, were they on good terms?—Very good terms.

Were the carryings on only occasional, and did they generally take place after the house was closed?—Yes.

Did you sometimes assist in the business?—Yes; Bessie took a prominent part in the bar.

When the accused said, "Your friend is dead," did you take him seriously?—I did not. I thought it was just his way of putting it.

When Bessie was able to get about did she prepare the food herself?—Yes. When she was ill I would ask the accused for anything and he would get it. He got beef tea or milk.

Could you see everything he gave her?—Yes.

If he had put anything into it would you have noticed it?—I should have noticed it.

Did you ever notice him putting anything into the food?—No.

Could you have tasted it if you had liked?—Yes.

Were you perfectly free to do anything you liked with it?—Yes.

When you visited Bessie and she was ill, did you have something to drink?—Yes.

Did you always find it all right?—I always thought it was all right. Sometimes I had port, and sometimes a glass of ale.

Where did it come from?—From the bar.

Did you ask for it?—Sometimes I would ask for it, and sometimes the accused would give it to me.

Was it what had been got for Bessie?—No. The brandy and things for her were always in the room when I got there.

Did you have any brandy?—I had a glass of brandy once.

Was it brandy that had been brought into the room for her?—No; it was there for me.

Did the accused tell you to take it?—Yes, and I did so.

Was there a nurse named Stevens there?—Yes.

Do you know if she was properly qualified?—I do not know. She seemed to be competent, and paid every attention to Bessie.

Do you know whether she prepared any of the food?—I do not know, because I was not there when it was prepared.

Did you see Dr. Stoker?—No.

Did Bessie seem to have all she wished in the way of food?—Yes.

Did you ever hear her complain that she could not get what she wanted?—No.

By a JURYMAN—Did the accused ever kiss you?—He kissed me once or twice.

Did he ever make any overtures to you?—No, he never made any overtures to me nor said that I could be Mrs. Chapman.

Did he kiss you while Bessie was about?—Yes.

Did he say anything when he did so?—No.

Mrs. MARTHA STEVENS, examined—I live at 22 Fanshaw Avenue, Barking, and have been a nurse for a number of years. I used to live at Union Street, Borough. Two or three months before Christmas, 1900, I got to know the accused and Bessie Taylor at the Monument. When I first knew Bessie she seemed pretty well in health. Later on she complained to me of being fatigued, languid, and having pains in her stomach. I suggested that she should go to the doctor. She made a complaint to me, and I mentioned Dr. Stoker's name. I went with her to his surgery more than once. He gave her some medicine. She seemed to rally, but not for long. I went to the Monument and nursed her about a week or ten days before Christmas. She engaged me herself. At first I only stayed during the day. She had

vomiting and diarrhœa, and great pain. She complained a little about her throat burning, and it was very red. On about two occasions I noticed perspiration. When she vomited it was severe, green, thick, and slimy. She did not complain much of being thirsty. When she did complain I saw milk, water, brandy and water, and champagne given to her.

At first I was the only person there in the daytime. The accused used to come and see her from time to time. He used to ask her how she was, and sometimes he held her hand in a friendly way. I sometimes prepared the nourishment she had, sometimes her mother, and sometimes the accused. After a time I stayed there during the night as well as the day. The accused was there during the night until Bessie's mother came, and then he went and slept in the parlour. I went back to my home in the daytime for an hour sometimes. Mrs. Taylor did not go out very often. She took a walk sometimes. Bessie was sometimes better and sometimes worse. One Sunday after Christmas she got up and went about the house, and then sat down and played the piano in the clubroom adjoining her bedroom. As she was playing, Dr. Stoker, who was attending her, came in, and he put his finger up so that I should not interrupt her, and he then said, "Capital." She looked round and discovered him there. I went home to sleep that night. I was sent for again on the Monday or Tuesday. Bessie seemed quite prostrated. She went to bed directly I got there. She said she was very tired and languid. She did not complain of pain. She had violent sickness and diarrhœa. Dr. Stoker came.

I was with Bessie on the 13th of February, and about 1.30 a.m. I thought she was dying, so I called the accused. He came up just as she was dying. He looked at her, and I think he said, "Oh, she has gone," and he commenced to cry. I stopped a day or two in the house, and on the 15th the body was removed in a coffin to the railway station.

Cross-examined—Did you know Dr. Stoker before you went to the Monument?—I did.

Did you introduce him to the Chapmans?—Yes.

Were three specialists also called in while you were there?—Yes.

Mrs Martha Stevens

Do you remember their names?—No.

Who asked them to come?—I believe Mrs. Taylor asked them to come.

Altogether there were four doctors?—Yes. They examined Bessie, and had a consultation in the clubroom. They came up and saw her again.

Was the accused present?—The accused was not present; he came up afterwards.

Did he seem willing that the consultation should be held?—Yes.

Did he speak to the doctors?—He spoke to the doctors downstairs.

Did you hear the doctors say what was the matter with Bessie?—No.

How long was Mrs. Taylor in the house?—About a fortnight.

During that time did Bessie have everything that was prescribed for her?—Yes; she was looked after with every possible care.

Did the accused seem to be willing to have everything done that could be done?—Yes; he got everything that was suggested.

Who generally prepared the food?—Mrs. Taylor.

Did the accused bring up anything?—He brought up some champagne.

Do you not remember him bringing up any food?—No.

Did he interfere with the doctor's treatment?—I do not think so.

Did you ever see him giving Bessie medicine?—No; I took the responsibility and carried out Dr. Stoker's orders.

What did you have to drink while you were there?—I had some ale whilst I was there.

Did you have any champagne?—No.

Could you not have had what you liked?—I could.

Did the accused and Bessie seem to be fond of one another?—Yes.

When she seemed to be better did he seem to be pleased?—Yes.

Could you go about the house as you liked?—Yes.

Did the accused ever send you out of the room?—No.

Or prevent you from getting any food Bessie wanted?—No.

Mrs Martha Stevens

Re-examined—Did you ever have any suspicion of unfair play?—No.

Where were the medicines generally kept?—In the bedroom.

Did you go out sometimes?—Yes.

And had the accused always access to the bedroom?—Yes.

When did you go there?—I did not go there until after Christmas.

By a JURYMAN—Did you ever drink any brandy?—No.

Did the accused ever ask you to have any medicine?—No.

Dr. JAMES MAURICE STOKER (recalled), further examined—I was called to the Monument on 1st January, 1901. I first saw the accused about a fortnight before that, when he came to my surgery. Previous to that Bessie Taylor had called on me and asked for some medicine. I then attended her. Mrs. Stevens was there. I visited Mrs. Chapman almost daily from 1st January to 13th February, when she died. When I first called she was in bed; she had vomiting and diarrhœa, and pains in the stomach, and the stomach was very tender. The vomit was green. I cannot recollect if I saw her vomiting. I prescribed for her. She used to get better and then go back again. I suggested another doctor being called in. I had three separate consultations with three other doctors. One was Dr. Sunderland, who is a specialist in the diseases of women. He only saw her once. I was under the impression that Mrs. Chapman was suffering from some womb trouble. I do not recollect if Dr. Sunderland suggested any alteration in the treatment. She did not make any improvement, and I then suggested another doctor. Somebody in the house suggested Dr. Thorpe, of Southwark Bridge Road. He and I examined Mrs. Chapman together. He said he thought she was suffering from a severe form of hysteria. I then got Dr. Cotter, and we examined the patient together. He thought she was suffering from some cancerous disease of the stomach or intestines. In consequence I sent a portion of her vomit to the Clinical Research Association, with directions to see if there was any trace of cancer. That would be a microscopical examination. They found no trace. The constant vomiting and diarrhœa continued more or less during the whole time that I was there.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Dr James M. Stoker

I remember one evening going in and finding her playing the piano. I cannot recollect the date. She appeared very much better, and in consequence I said I would not call back again unless I was sent for. I do not recollect if I had any conversation with the accused on that day. I was sent for the next day. I found her worse than ever. I was with her the day before she died. She was very bad then with the same symptoms. I do not recollect whether on that day I thought she was dying or not. Next day I heard of her death. I was asked to give a certificate, which I did, giving the cause of death as intestinal obstruction, vomiting, and exhaustion. She was suffering from vomiting and ordinary stoppage when she came to my surgery. Diarrhœa would follow when the stoppage was cleared. I did not put the particulars in the certificate, "G. Chapman, widower of deceased." I thought the accused was married to the woman. I never had such a thing as antimony at this period, and I never prescribed it.

Cross-examined—Had you seen Mrs. Stevens before?—Yes.

Was it on her recommendation that you went to the Chapmans?—Yes.

Up to that time had you known anything of them?—No.

What did you think was the matter with Mrs. Chapman?—At first I regarded the case as one of constipation, and I directed my treatment with the view of removing that. I attended her at her home for excessive diarrhœa, so the stoppage must have given way.

How often did she come to your surgery?—I think she came twice.

Do you remember what you gave her?—I do not remember what I gave her, but it would be most likely a dose of salts.

When did you next see her?—I next saw her at her home on 1st January, when I treated her for diarrhœa and vomiting.

What did you give her then?—I do not know.

Did you see the accused?—I did.

Do you remember if, when you suggested to him that you would like further advice, it was within the month?—I do not remember.

Did he at once agree?—Yes.

Dr James M. Stoker

And I believe that Dr. Sunderland came to the conclusion that she was suffering from some uterine trouble?—Yes, I believe he did, but I have no record of it.

Have you seen him since?—No.

Did the accused see Dr. Sunderland when he came, and ask him what was the matter with his wife?—Yes.

Was he dissatisfied with your opinion?—I do not remember that he was dissatisfied with our opinion.

Was he willing to have a third doctor?—Yes.

He paid the fees?—Yes.

Whom did you consult with?—Dr. Thorpe.

What did Dr. Thorpe tell the accused?—I think he told him that the woman had hysteria.

And did he accept that opinion?—Yes, he accepted that opinion as he had accepted Dr. Sunderland's.

And was it at your suggestion that a fourth doctor was called in, because the woman was getting no better?—Yes.

And did the accused agree to that?—Yes.

Do you know what fee he paid in each case?—No.

Did he grumble?—No.

What did Dr. Cotter say?—Dr. Cotter said it was some cancerous disease of the stomach or intestines.

Did Mr. Bodmer examine the vomit?—Yes, I think he examined the vomit that I sent.

Was Dr. Cotter's opinion sustained?—No.

Was the report told to the accused?—No.

Did the patient live long after that?—No.

What opinion did you have?—I had many opinions.

Have you any record of your treatment?—No.

If the specialist had suggested an alteration in the medicine would you have made it?—I certainly would.

Re-examined—None of you suspected poison?—No.

By Mr. Justice Grantham—Was she cured of constipation?—As far as I can tell she was cured of constipation.

Can you get vomiting with hysteria?—Yes, and you can imagine a lot when you have hysteria.

What was Dr. Thorpe's opinion?—I think Dr. Thorpe thought the woman was imagining.

Did it occur to you that she was not suffering?—No.

What was the primary cause?—Constipation.

And what caused her death?—The vomiting and exhaustion had caused her death.

Would it not have been wise to have had a post-mortem?—It would probably have been wise to have a post-mortem before giving a certificate, as all the doctors were evidently wrong.

Have you ever known a case where four doctors gave four different opinions, and when the patient died still there was no post-mortem?—No.

Arthur Neil, further examined—I have searched the records at Somerset House between January, 1898, and March, 1900, and I can find no record of a marriage between George Chapman and Bessie Taylor, or Severin Klosowski and Bessie Taylor.

William Tull, examined—I live at 11 Warwick Street, Blackfriars, and I am manager to Mr. Smith, undertaker, at 122 Southwark Bridge Road. On 13th February, 1901, I went to the Monument with a coffin. I saw the accused there. He had been to the shop earlier that day. I went upstairs and saw a woman's body. The accused gave the name as Bessie Chapman. I coffined the body, and early on 15th February it was conveyed to St. Pancras Station. On 22nd November, 1902, I went with Inspector Godley to Lymm, in Cheshire, where I saw a grave opened and three coffins taken out. The third was the one in which the body of Bessie Chapman had been placed. I identified it by the nameplate on it, which I had myself engraved. The lid was removed, and Dr. Stevenson saw the body inside.

William Kelsall, examined—I live at Agden, near Altrincham, in Cheshire. I knew the late Mr. and Mrs. Taylor, the parents of Bessie Taylor. On 22nd November, 1902, I was present at Lymm Churchyard, and I saw, in a coffin which was then opened, the body of Bessie Taylor.

The Court adjourned.

Fourth Day—Thursday, 19th March, 1903.

Dr. Thomas Stevenson (recalled), further examined—On 22nd November, 1902, I was at Lymm Churchyard, Cheshire, and I saw Bessie Taylor's coffin taken from the grave. It had a plate on it, "Bessie Chapman, died 13th February, 1901, aged 36 years." The body was covered with a mouldy growth, but otherwise was fresh. There was no putrefaction and no odour. The tissues were dry. The muscles had a red and freshish appearance. There was a fæcal odour in the abdomen, but no putrefactive odour. Although the features had mould on them, one could follow the shape and general contour. The breast was shrunken and the whole body dry. Generally when bodies decompose they become wet and slimy. This was one extremely well preserved except for the superficial skin.

I made an examination of the various organs. On the base of the right lung I found some old adhesions from old pleurisy. The lungs were shrunken and dry, but otherwise healthy and free from deposits or cavities. Adhesions are quite common in people of good health in middle life and after. The heart and its valves were healthy. The stomach was empty, but its vessels were filled with dark blood to an unusual extent. On the inner surface of the gullet end of the stomach there was a patch about 4 inches in diameter of a cinnabar red colour which denoted gastritis. There was no ulceration or perforation or any loss of substance in the mucous membrane of the stomach. The cinnabar red colour extended more or less through the bowels, indicating enteritis. The inner surface of the bowel was coated with a yellow paint-like stuff, which was sulphide of antimony. The pancreas, spleen, kidneys, and liver were all shrunken by time, but otherwise normal. The womb, ovaries, appendages, and bladder were quite normal. I found no trace of cancer nor uterine trouble. I could find no sign of any cause of death. I examined the brain. It was a good deal decomposed. There was no

sign of hæmorrhage, or any other recognisable disease. I found no intestinal obstruction. I formed the opinion that she had died from gastro-enteritis, which was due to some irritant poison.

I removed the stomach, bowels, liver, spleen, kidneys, heart, brain, and lungs, and subjected them all to analysis and examination. The analysis showed that antimony was present in all those parts. There was no other poison. In the stomach there was 0.12 of a grain of metallic antimony, in the bowel 8.43 grains, in the liver 1.64 grains, in the kidneys 0.30 of a grain, making a total of 10.49 grains. That represents of tartar-emetic in the stomach 0.32 of a grain, in the bowel 23.43 grains, in the liver 4.55 grains, in the kidneys 0.82 of a grain, making in all 29.12 grains. I cannot find any recorded case of such a quantity having been found in the bowel after death. It suggests that she had some large dose not long before her death. I examined the earth about the coffin, but found no poison.

Cross-examined—How long had the woman been buried?—About twenty-one months.

How long had Isabella Spink been interred?—Practically five years.

And neither body was putrid?—No.

What was the mould you referred to?—Taylor was covered with ordinary vegetable fungi. There were conditions about the body that I identified with the case of Spink.

How did you know it was the body of Bessie Taylor?—I compared Taylor's features with a photograph which I was told was hers, and I could recognise the general contour. The nose and cheeks had preserved their shape, but I could not distinguish the eyes.

There had been a change in her?—Yes, there had been a change in her which was more remarkable than in the case of Spink, where there had been practically none. I think Taylor's body contained more antimony than Spink's.

Given the same conditions as far as the coffin and grave were concerned, would you have expected to find that a woman who had only been buried twenty months, and had more antimony in her body, would be less subject to change than a woman who had been buried five years and had less antimony?—Yes.

Dr Thomas Stevenson

What kind of coffin was it?—Taylor's coffin was a dry elm one, and, as far as I could judge, the body had not been contaminated by contact with the soil, which was very dry and sandy loam.

Where does putrefaction generally begin?—Putrefaction generally begins through the nose, mouth, and anus, and spreads outwards. There was none of that in either of them. The superficial decomposition of the body was due to the growth of mould.

Does the presence of antimony not prevent the growth of moulds?—No; in fact, they will grow in a strong solution of tartar-emetic.

The long railway journey which Taylor's body had taken and the growth of mould were distinct from the case of Spink's?—And the growth of mould would depend on the cleansing of the body after death. Bessie Taylor's body was apparently cleaner than that of Spink, as the latter had had a severe flooding shortly before death, but that would only affect one part of the body.

Have you any reason to suppose that either of the bodies was not properly cleaned?—No.

Richard Bodmer (recalled), further examined—I took part in the chemical analysis with Dr. Stevenson on the parts of Taylor's body which were removed. I have heard his evidence, and agree with his conclusions.

George Godley (recalled), further examined—On 25th October I went with Inspector Kemp to the Crown. The first communication about this case was made to me through Dr. Stoker about midnight of that day. A telegram was sent to Dr. Waldo, the coroner, at 4.19 a.m. on the 25th, and at 10 a.m. I saw his officer. At noon I went to the Crown and saw the accused. I said, "Are you Mr. Chapman?" He said, "Yes." I said, "I wish to speak to you quietly." I did not then say who I was. There was nobody in the parlour on the same floor, and he asked me to go in there. I said, "I am inspector of police for this district; Maud Marsh, who has been living with you as your wife, has been poisoned with arsenic, and from the surrounding circumstances I shall take you to the police station while I make

inquiries." He said, "I know nothing about it; I do not know how she got the poison; she has been in Guy's Hospital for the same sort of sickness." I said, "Before we go to the police station I am going to examine the bedroom where she died." He made no reply, but led the way upstairs to the second floor back room. He took a key from his trousers pocket and unlocked the door. I said, "I am going to take possession of all medicine bottles." I saw the three bottles which have been produced. They were on the floor by the fireplace. The accused stooped down and picked them up and gave them to me. I said, "If you have any money in that safe you had better count it." There was a safe in the bedroom. He said, "The safe is broken," and he produced a bunch of keys from his pocket and unlocked one of the small drawers in the chest of drawers, and took from it in coin and notes £268 10s. There were some bottles in the room. I locked it up and left Sergeant Kemp outside the door. I took the key with me to the station with the accused, where he was detained.

About 4 p.m. I returned to the Crown, and found Kemp still in charge. I went into the room and took possession of the bottles and some other articles. I went into the box-room on the other side of the passage. I found several boxes and other articles there. In the bedroom I found three powders, which were produced yesterday, and some medical books. The pocket book I found in the office downstairs with a Pharmacopœia. I found one of the syringes and Kemp found the other, which he handed to me. I also found the little book in Polish, the papers in Russian, the will, an American revolver in a case, fully loaded, a number of photographic chemicals, and bottles of various kinds; also a number of papers and documents, amongst them the photograph of Bessie Taylor. Some of the papers related to the change from the Prince of Wales to the Grapes, from the Grapes to the Monument, and from the Monument to the Crown; also a typewritten letter from Biggs & Co., dated 8th September, 1902, to "Mr. G. Chapman," at the Crown. [This stated that they regretted having been unable to find a customer, and that in order to push matters forward they suggested advertisements being inserted in the daily papers,

which would no doubt effect a sale.] I also found bills relating to the funeral of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor. In the pocket book there is an entry, "13th February, 1901, Wednesday. Bessie Taylor dead, at 1.30 a.m., with great sorrow," and on 28th October, 1901, "Sunday, 27th, to Mabele Spink married." I gave certain bottles and powders to Kemp, with certain instructions.

At 7 p.m. on 25th October I went into the charge room at the station and saw the accused. He said, "Can I have bail?" I said, "No, I have not finished my inquiries yet; it is a very serious case of poisoning." He said, "She did not die suddenly; if she had been poisoned she would have done." I had the three bismuth powders with me then. I said, "I found these three powders on the drawers in your bedroom." He said, "The doctor sent them." I said, "I am going to see the doctor and finish my inquiries." I left him, and again saw him at 10.15. I said, "It is now my duty to charge you with the wilful murder of Maud Marsh by poisoning her with arsenic." He said, "I am innocent; can I have bail?" I said, "No."

On the Monday he was brought before the magistrate and remanded from time to time until 12th November, when the case was commenced by the calling of evidence. From that date up to the end of December he was charged as George Chapman. In the meantime I had been making inquiries, and on 31st December I charged him in the name of Severin Klosowski with the wilful murder of Mary Isabella Spink, otherwise Chapmán, on 25th December, 1897, at the Prince of Wales. I also charged him with the wilful murder of Bessie Chapman, otherwise Taylor, on 13th February, 1901. When I told him of the name of Klosowski, and the charge was read over to him, he said, "I do not know the other fellow." In answer to the charge of murder he said, "By what means, stabbing, shooting, or what?" I said, "The inspector will read the charge to you after he has taken it down." It was written down and read over to him. He said, "Who is the other fellow?" I said, "That is you; we call you Severin Klosowski, otherwise George Chapman." He said, "I do not know anything about the other name." I was present at each of the exhumations.

Evidence for Prosecution.

George Godley

Cross-examined—I made a complete search all through the house, and dealt with everything that I considered relevant to this charge.

William Kemp, examined—I am an inspector of police. On 25th October I accompanied Inspector Godley to the Crown, and assisted him in searching the premises and taking away the things we found. I found this green syringe. About 7 p.m. on that day I saw the accused in the charge room at the station. He said, "Can I speak to you a minute?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Your inspector brought some white powders in just now, which he said he had found on the drawers in the bedroom. Has the doctor examined them yet?" I said, "I do not know at present." He said, "I would not hurt her for the world. I have had a lot of trouble with my barmaids, but I took a great fancy to this one. There was some jealousy lately. She said to me, 'I have been with you now twelve or thirteen months, and have not had a baby yet; if I do not soon have one, you won't have me with you long.' Her sister would bring her baby with her sometimes, and after she had gone Maud would sit and cry for a long time." With the exception of the books and documents, all the bottles, syringes, and other articles that we found in the house I took to Dr. Stevenson. I afterwards received them back from him. I received some bismuth from Dr. Stoker, which I also handed to Dr. Stevenson in the same state.

Evidence for the prosecution closed.

Speech for the Defence.

Mr. Elliott, who intimated that he did not intend to call any evidence, then proceeded to address the jury as follows:—I fully admit the magnitude of the task before me, especially as the Solicitor-General, by virtue of his position as an officer of the Crown, has the right of reply. The case, unfortunately, has been surrounded by a storm of prejudice which in any other country might have imperilled the calm administration of justice. There is also the fact that the

Mr Elliott

accused is an alien, and we all know the feelings which at the present time are entertained generally against the immigration of aliens into this country. Thus, in addition to the prejudice I have referred to, I have the great difficulty of the accused's nationality to deal with.

The accused undoubtedly stands before you under circumstances most lamentable. His is a crime, if guilty he be, which has ever been regarded with the utmost horror, and no doubt, gentlemen, during the four days you have been occupied upon this case, you have been wondering what could have been the accused's motive. There are not the usual inducements present in cases of this kind. There was no necessity for the accused to resort to any act of this sort to free himself from the one woman so that he might live with another. None of the women appears to have thrown any difficulty in the way of living with the accused, so that of any adequate motive for the crime there was none. I would ask you, gentlemen, to remember that I am not here to prove the accused's innocence. I am here to refute the proofs of guilt put forward by the Crown, and unless you are satisfied beyond all human doubt that this hideous charge has been substantiated against the accused—if I can show that the Crown have not proved their case—I feel sure it will be your duty and your pleasure to free yourselves from the responsibility of having to send to his doom a fellow-creature, however loathsome and revolting you might in other respects regard him.

The purchase of the tartar-emetic at Hastings is undoubtedly a most important incident, but I cannot help thinking that Mr. Davidson, the chemist, was singularly accessible in the easy sale of poisons, and that his memory must be somewhat defective. You have heard throughout that the accused had offered no objection to the free access of doctors to the deceased persons. Nor did he in any way attempt to disguise his movements. Indeed, when he was arrested he was in possession of a list of the houses he had kept and the dates he had occupied them. Again, none of the women appeared to have made any serious complaint of the accused's conduct towards them. Indeed, some of the witnesses had spoken strongly of his affection for the women

and the solicitude he always showed for their recovery. He did not even select for himself the doctors called in to attend the women. In the case of Maud Marsh it had been suggested he had deliberately murdered her to marry Florence Rayner, but why should he have done this? He had but to tell Maud Marsh to go, and she must have left, as she had no claim upon him. Or he might have gone away himself, as he suggested to Florence Rayner he was willing to do, to America. The illness of Maud Marsh had in truth nothing to do with the appearance on the scene of Florence Rayner. In Dr. Stevenson's evidence I admit I have an overwhelming case to meet, but I think you will pause before you condemn a man merely upon the scientific evidence of a gentleman, however eminent he may be, without strong corroboration.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I would remind you that if you condemn the accused by your verdict it will be impossible to repair the mistake, if mistake has been made. Your verdict will be irrevocable, and I beg you to pause long before finding the accused guilty. The accused is a hated alien, and has all the prejudice against him which lies in that term, but I confidently appeal to you to exercise that wise and prudent consideration which always in this Court holds the balance between right and wrong.

Closing Speech for the Prosecution.

The Solicitor-General—I have to congratulate my learned friend, Mr. Elliott, upon his able defence. In this Court we know no difference between the alien and the stranger and a citizen of this country. It is our proud boast that here, at all events, whatever it may be in other countries, it matters not to us who is the person on his trial, as all are entitled to the same law and the same justice.

Learned counsel has commented upon the absence of motive, but what is the use of seeking for motive when we have the actual fact of the murder? In this instance there was the most ample motive, for the prisoner's was a history of unbridled, heartless, and cruel lust. The case does not rest merely upon scientific evidence. There is the most ample corroboration. It is the prisoner who has been shown to

The Solicitor-General

have purchased a large quantity of antimony—we have the very label—and the poison is the poison which was common to all the persons whose deaths we are inquiring into. There is the same hand in each of the poisonings, and the little risk he ran in calling in the doctors is shown by the number of surgeons who were actually called in, and all of whom were deceived as to what these women suffered from. The prisoner's skill in medicine showed how far he could go. The doctors thought they were dealing with a respectable man, and hence they were deceived into giving certificates of death.

It is a most serious thing for a doctor to throw suspicion upon a household, and the prisoner in his statements showed conclusively how accurate he was in his power to deceive the doctors, and if from some cause or other Dr. Stoker had not desired further explanation and had given the prisoner a certificate of death in the case of Maud Marsh, it is shocking to contemplate what might still be going on at the Crown. The attentions paid by the prisoner to these women were the necessary mask for all that foul plot. We have now to do justice in the matter, and the exigencies of public justice and public law require you to do your duty like men.

Judge's Summing Up.

Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—Gentlemen of the jury, after the two eloquent addresses you have heard, I am sure it is unnecessary for me to remind you of the gravity of the task on which you are engaged, or do more than remind you that the issue is one on which the life of the prisoner depends, and that the unhappy girl Maud Marsh died from the administration of poison.

This case, I think, is unique, not only from a medical point of view or a chemical point of view, but also unique from a legal and criminal point of view, and, in another aspect of the case, from a medical point of view as distinct from a chemical point of view.

It is unique because of the discovery which has enabled Dr. Stevenson to show the power of antimony, and how it preserves the body. It is unique from a legal and criminal point of view from the fact that, as far as I know, it is the first

time in which the antecedents of the prisoner have been investigated in the way in which they have been on the present occasion, and on which it has been found possible, as well as legal, to bring forward evidence of two other cases in which persons have died at the hands of some one and died by the poison administered to them, and, as it is suggested, by the prisoner at the bar.

Probably you know enough of criminal law—the basis of our law, and where it is different from that of other countries, that we strain every nerve to prevent the jury being aware of any bad antecedents of the prisoner, and of any previous convictions, and probably you were not surprised with the learned counsel, who has done everything he could for his client, when he objected to any evidence connected with the unhappy deaths of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor.

The evidence being admitted is inconsistent with the usual rule. The point has been argued at length, and in one case the learned judge declined to admit the evidence, but that case has been overruled, and it has been decided in cases, particularly of circumstantial evidence, that it is admissible to refer to previous instances to disprove any suggestion of mistake in the result of any action on the part of the prisoner, in the particular case which is charged against him.

Here all you have to do is to determine whether Maud Marsh died at the hands of the prisoner, and you have nothing to do with the question as to whether Mrs. Spink or Miss Taylor died at his hands. That is no part of your duty at the present time, but you are entitled to consider the circumstances attending their deaths, so as to negative any suggestion that may be made on the part of the prisoner, that what happened in the case of Maud Marsh was accidental. It is in that way and in that respect only that the law allows you to inquire into the cases and the circumstances attending the death of those two unfortunate women.

One of you very properly asked a question as to the evidence of another doctor, but I was at once obliged to tell you that, as we were not inquiring into the deaths of these two women, it was not within my province to allow counsel for the prosecution to call that evidence, because it was only admissible upon the charge of their deaths if it was being made against the prisoner.

Mr Justice Grantham

This case is unique from the fact of this evidence being admitted, and of the going back so far in this case. But, gentlemen, I said it was unique in another aspect, and that is the medical aspect apart from the chemical aspect, and I may say I feel very sorry indeed to be obliged to comment on this part of the case, because I am one of those who do feel the enormous benefits rendered to society by the medical profession in this country. I am constantly in my judicial duties being brought into connection with them. Often badly paid, and living, as they are obliged to do, in uncomfortable surroundings where there are few educated persons, yet their care and attention of the poor people is as kind as if they were the most wealthy in the land, and the amount of skill they bring into use is almost incredible. But, gentlemen, that is not so in this case, and it is a very sad thing that a person who has up to now occupied only the position of a hairdresser has been able to defy the doctors, and who for years, if the evidence is true, has been carrying on practices of this kind perfectly irrespective of the doctors and without the slightest fear of their being able to discover it.

Gentlemen, it is very sad that that should be the fact in this case. It is true he has studied in a medical school at Warsaw, and he has occupied the position of, shall I say, a superior dresser, a sort of junior surgeon, and in that way he has acquired a certain amount of medical skill; but it is very sad to think that one whose position as surgeon was such that he could not follow it, or did not wish to follow it, and he came over here to act as an assistant hairdresser for several years, and yet his knowledge of poison and medicine should enable him to baffle the surgeons for five or six long years, for that is really what the evidence points to.

Now, we have first of all the case of Mrs. Spink as long ago as 1897. We do not know so much about it, for the reason that we are not trying him on that murder. I am only referring to it to show the effect of his conduct, and to show he was completely enabled to baffle the skilled medical man, Dr. Rogers.

There were symptoms which the poor woman suffered from which are well known, I should have thought, to every doctor, symptoms of poisoning, poisoning where the person is being poisoned illegally. Of course, they may be symptoms of natural

disease, but if the symptoms are symptoms of natural disease there are remedies which would affect that disease, and yet what is so strange is, that these medical gentlemen, knowing what the remedy is to affect the natural cause of the pain and suffering she is undergoing, and seeing that those remedies fail to touch it, it never occurs to them to think what other cause there is to produce this pain. You would think the greatest tyro would have thought, "Where did she get those pains?" It never seems to have occurred to anybody. When this poor woman died in 1897 Dr. Rogers actually gives a certificate for something which could not, by any possibility, have been the cause of her death, and by that certificate prevents any examination being made, and if it was not that, fortunately, in this country at any rate, cremation is not the usual system—if it had been, by no possibility could these poisonings have been discovered, and I hope it will be taken as a warning that our churchyards should not be shut up, and that people should not say we should not bury in the churchyard. If that is the law it will increase the deaths by poisoning, but here we have men like Dr. Stevenson, and they can tell us what happened six years ago just as well as if it took place yesterday, if bodies are preserved by antimony.

Then after 1897 you find another woman who fell a victim to his lust, Bessie Taylor, taken ill in the same way. Dr. Stoker is called in. It is certainly unfortunate that his memory should be such a blank as to what he did in this case, but I know the position that doctors of that position are placed in, and it is too much to expect that they should have time to make a record, or be able to pay anybody else to make a record of what took place, but I am very sorry he cannot give us some assistance in regard to the medicines he used in his efforts to relieve the pain from which this poor woman was suffering.

He was called in in 1900. The parents very fortunately come upon the scene, and they do the best they can for their poor daughter, and desire some one else called in. As has been recalled to you by the learned Solicitor-General, the prisoner seemed perfectly indifferent to any doctor; he had boasted he could give her "that," and no one would be the

wiser. Dr. Sunderland was called in, and he was eminent in the complaints of women. If you do call in specialists they are apt to find out what you are suffering from, but, gentlemen, it did not take them long to know that his advice was not worth what was being paid for it, because it was quite evident he was wrong.

Then they called in the opinion of Dr. Thorpe, and it was like going from the frying-pan into the fire, for the pain and agony that poor woman was suffering was, in the opinion of Dr. Thorpe, put on.

Well, gentlemen, Dr. Stoker seems to have been better than either Sunderland or Thorpe, because he won't have that, and then Dr. Stoker calls in a friend of his, Dr. Cotter, who certainly so far—he is not in a high-class district—but it seems to me that Dr. Stoker and Dr. Cotter are both of them better than the others who were called in, because Dr. Cotter suggested that she might be suffering from cancer. But although I cannot help saying that Dr. Stoker was not equal to his position, they do very properly have an examination, a microscopical examination, and by that examination they can tell whether it is a cancerous growth or not. But they could not do that by analysis, or they don't do it by analysis; it is by microscopical examination. They have this microscopical examination, showing that they were alive to what she might be suffering from. The answer is no cancer of any kind. Then they rest on their oars. Dr. Stoker, who had been attending her from the first, knowing that the other doctor's advice is of no value, does not follow it up, having found it was not cancer. Then what is it?

If he had had any originality about him, which you would think all doctors would have, he would have said, "What is it that brought about this state of irritation?" One would have thought he would have struck at once on an irritant poison of some kind, not necessarily administered by the prisoner, but for the purpose of saving this poor woman. "What is it that gives her this pain, something irritant," then why not talk to the husband to find out what the poison can be? Then if he could not find out what it is, then it might have occurred to him, "I must inquire into this matter, and I must have an analysis of that which comes

from her," particularly after they have had the microscopical examination.

Then, unfortunately, on her death he gives a certificate which he must know was not the true certificate, a certificate founded on his ignorance, because she had had constipation of which he had cured her, and she dies from vomiting and diarrhœa; he puts the two things together, and says she died from intestinal obstruction and vomiting and diarrhœa, as if anybody reading of the vomiting and diarrhœa would think they were the direct result of intestinal obstruction. They were not. But that is not the end of it, because all these doctors having been beaten by the prisoner, we have to come to the next case, that with which we are immediately concerned, the case of Maud Marsh.

There you find Dr. Stoker, in the innocence of his mind, never having investigated the other case, as you would have thought he would, was again called in, and goes through the same acts, except that nobody else is called in. I am not surprised at all, because he got no assistance before, but he sees this poor woman dying by hours in the greatest agony, yet it never occurs to him what was the cause of death.

If it was an irritant poison of some kind, you would have thought any doctor would have traced it, and if it had not been for poor old Mr. and Mrs. Marsh, if it had not been for them, I do not believe there would have been the slightest chance of detecting the cause of death, and other victims would probably have been added, if you believe the evidence.

Poor old Marsh and his wife came up, and they suggest having some one else. The prisoner won't hear of it. "What is the good of it; fifty won't help"; but without asking his help they send Dr. Grapel up, and for the first time we do get some originality and some intelligence brought to bear. He and Dr. Stoker come to the point, not at once, for they naturally think it is ptomaine poisoning, but, from any investigation they make or information they obtain, nothing would show how it is caused. There was the rabbit, but the rabbit had not poisoned any one else—I believe the prisoner did say he felt poorly—but that was not the beginning of her illness, so that could not have caused the inception of this pain and irritation—but I say, not until they thought it might be ptomaine poisoning do they suspect everything.

Mr Justice Grantham

They do not know what had caused it; I do not think anybody has heard of ptomaine poisoning from eating a rabbit bought in a shop; but on his way home Dr. Grapel, who again showed his skill in the matter and the way in which a doctor, it seems to me, ought to puzzle out a thing of that kind, Dr. Grapel grinding it over in his mind, all at once the thing strikes him, it is not ptomaine at all; it is arsenic, and she has been poisoned by somebody.

Really that is the first time in all these long years that any intelligence had been brought in. Unfortunately, Dr. Grapel did not do what I think he ought to have done; he does not think she is going to die at once. At any rate she was suffering very badly and was as ill as anybody could be, and her agony was frightful to witness. Not one moment was to be lost in preventing any more arsenic being given to her. In any case one would have thought Dr. Grapel would have gone back at once, and gone and seen Dr. Stoker and discussed what should be done. But no, he does nothing. The next day he sees the father and says, "I will go and see her again," and does nothing, because some one tells him she is dead.

Then he does not communicate with Dr. Stoker until the next day. What happened in the meantime? If you believe the evidence you can have no doubt the fatal dose was administered after Dr. Grapel and Dr. Stoker had come to the conclusion that she was being poisoned—I must not say that—but after Dr. Grapel had come to the conclusion that it was arsenical poison, and after the conclusion that Dr. Stoker had come to that she had ptomaine poisoning.

In the evidence of Mrs. Marsh, as far as we can tell, it was that night the fatal dose was given. That seems to have been the same way as the poor woman was killed on the other occasion, when apparently he got frightened and thought it would not be wise to hesitate any longer.

Apparently he got frightened when Dr. Grapel came, for he said, "What have you come for?" If the prisoner got frightened after Dr. Grapel had been up, and had been making his investigation, he may have taken the opportunity, when no one was looking—you remember the evidence how he mixed the things she drank—of putting in the fatal dose.

a large quantity of which was found by Dr. Stevenson in the bowels.

What ought to have been done, and it seems to me so strange, was not done, was that that which she was given, and that which she vomited, should have been examined at once. If Dr. Grapel had gone back at once and seen Dr. Stoker again, who was alive to this illness, they could, surreptitiously if you like, in some way or other, not only have taken the vomit and the excrement, but also some of that which she was given. The mother could have been brought into the secret and been asked to take some of the brandy and water that was given to her. There can be no doubt, if you believe the evidence, that there was a large dose of antimony in the brandy and water, because it was that very night that Mrs. Marsh and Jessie Toon tasted it. One drinks a little and the other tastes it. The one who drinks a little suffers in the same way as the deceased; she had to go to the closet five or six times, and she vomited. Jessie Toon said it tasted bitter and burnt her mouth, and she had to eat some bread and butter to take the taste out of her mouth. If Dr. Grapel had gone back that night the girl's life might have been saved. I do not say it would, but there would have been no opportunity of making away with tartar-emetic between the Wednesday morning and his being apprehended by the police on the Saturday, or even before he had any idea there was going to be a coroner's inquiry.

The evidence is very startling with regard to that last night. Mrs. Marsh says the deceased woke up about three or four in the morning and asked for some drink. She gave her some drink which the prisoner had brought up—"I gave her some brandy, she vomited again, and that was the last time she vomited. I took a little brandy myself. I had diarrhœa and pains in the lower part of the stomach. I had about six attacks; I had to go to the w.c. on the second floor." (Reading his note.) Therefore, there can be no doubt it was at that time, if you believe the evidence, that that dose was given which suddenly brought about her death.

Well, gentlemen, I have been very sorry to make these remarks with regard to the medical aspect of the case, but I do think it is necessary that doctors should be alive to all

Mr Justice Grantham

these matters connected with their patients, and I cannot help commenting upon it. I think there has been a sad series of misadventures, to call them nothing else, with regard to the way in which the medical men have executed their skill on the poor patient who died.

Strange to say, it does not end there, because we find something of the same kind at one of the finest institutions in the world, at Guy's Hospital. I do not say they ought to have found it out there, but it certainly was remarkable. They don't find out anything; they suppose that it is inflammation of the bowel, enteritis or something of that kind; but apparently the doctor, who is a very eminent surgeon, who attended her, simply, as far as I can understand him, took the diagnosis of the case from a young man who was described as a clerk, and whose duty it was to make a record. He told me, it is within your recollection, and I hope my recollection is at fault, but he told us he never spoke to the woman, but he acted on the notes of the young man who took the report. The result of it is, the prisoner is able to say to the other doctors, "She has been to Guy's Hospital; what is the good of you thinking you can find out when they say there is nothing the matter with her there?"

I should have thought it would have suggested the cause when she got well, because the fact of her being removed, and curing her by degrees, would have suggested she had had something before she went there. She gradually got better, and she then goes back and never recovers thoroughly. You remember what the evidence was—on the very day she came back from the hospital one of her sisters found her sitting in the bar quite unfit to do anything, and helped her upstairs, and she practically never came down again, and she went on suffering, more or less, all the time, and very much more towards the end.

So much with regard to the medical aspect of the case, but, having said that which I was obliged to say, it is a great pleasure for us to know that the chemical skill of our doctors is so great that they are enabled after five or six years to unravel the mysteries of life and death, and to bring out of the body the constituent parts of that which had caused death, and which a person takes during life;

and, if you believe Dr. Stevenson, there can be no doubt that this poor woman died of antimony.

He gives you his evidence, and it is only my duty to comment upon the fact that the learned counsel for the prisoner, while he had the assistance of a very eminent surgeon in Court, who still remains sitting under the learned counsel, did not dispute or attempt to disprove anything that had been said by Dr. Stevenson. That being so, it seems to me, you cannot hesitate in believing the whole of the evidence of Dr. Stevenson. If that is the case, if his evidence is unimpeached, what are the facts on which we have to rely? They are, that this poor woman had such an amount of antimony in her body that it would have killed a great many people, and that antimonial poisoning was the cause of her death.

Now, gentlemen, antimony is a well-known poison, but, although in the pharmacopœia, it is rarely used now, its effects are well known. It is spoken of as a poison that has certain fine and well-known characteristics, and it is generally used in the form of tartar emetic or emetic tartar.

If she had that antimony in her it must have been given by some one; she could not very well have taken it herself. She might have done it, but there is no evidence or suggestion that she did; it must have been given by some one. By whom was it given? That is the investigation to which your attention has been drawn and which you will have to determine by your verdict after the few more observations I shall have to make. By whom was that antimony administered?

It seems to me the way you would reason out a case of this kind is by asking yourselves a few questions. Of what did this poor woman die? After the evidence of Dr. Stevenson can you doubt she died from antimony, and antimony administered in such large quantities that it makes it necessary for us to come to the conclusion that it must have been given to her deliberately and intentionally, and not accidentally?

If you have no doubt about that, the next question is, who had the opportunity of administering it? And it is in reference to that part of the case that the evidence of the cause of the deaths of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor becomes

Mr Justice Grantham

important, because, if the same person had the opportunity of administering the antimony in their cases as in the case of Maud Marsh—well, gentlemen, you have one of those pieces of evidence which in circumstantial evidence goes very far to be overwhelming to the prisoner.

Who had the opportunity of administering it? Pass your minds over all the people in contact with Mrs. Spink, Maud Marsh, or Bessie Taylor. In the case of Mrs. Spink, Dr. Rogers was called in, and there was a nurse. There is no suggestion that they administered it; the evidence in that case, as in the others, is that the prisoner's affection was so great apparently that he always gave her everything himself, so that almost all she had was given by him.

If he had the opportunity of administering the food and drink, he had the opportunity of administering antimony, and some one did administer it. If you find that in each of these three cases there was only one person who had the opportunity in all three cases, and in all three cases death resulted from antimony, gentlemen, is not the evidence overwhelming that the person who did it must be the same person who did it in all three cases, because there is nobody else suggested who could have done it?

The next inquiry is, although it is not necessary to answer it, had anybody any antimony, or was anybody proved to be in possession of any poison such as was found in the body of the deceased? After the evidence of Mr. Davidson, I think you can have no doubt whatever that the prisoner at one time was in possession of a considerable quantity of antimony which would have lasted him for many years.

There is great proof of the value of that part of our legislation which makes it necessary for our chemists to keep books for the sale of poisons in which persons put their names down and addresses. There you have the prisoner's own handwriting as the purchaser of this tartar emetic. I think we are much indebted to Mr. Davidson for keeping his book, and, when he saw the case in the papers, for turning back to his book to see if he had got that name, because he has assisted very materially in the administration of justice.

Well, some comment was made on the way in which he sold this very large quantity of antimony. I think it is fair to

say of Mr. Davidson that he seems to have done what a good many people do when they find others have knowledge which they don't expect them to have—you don't expect a barber to have experience of medicine—and when he found the prisoner did have this knowledge he "cottoned" to him to a certain extent, and it does not seem very strange to me that he should have allowed him to have the poison, taking the record of it as he did.

It does not seem very strange to me, particularly after he had put on it the label which was discovered, the label warning the person of its danger, and also the small quantity that might be safely administered.

Now, therefore, you have clearly one strong element in this case, namely, the possession of antimony by the prisoner. He is the only person in each of the three cases who had the opportunity of administering the poison.

That being so, what other question is there you have to ask yourselves? If she did die from antimony, and no one but the prisoner had an opportunity of administering it to her and the other persons who also died from antimony, and he is in possession of antimony—is there any other link in the chain wanting? If so, who must be the person who administered the antimony? That is the question for you to answer.

I am not surprised at the observation made, that you as people of this country should object to an alien, and a class of alien very much before the country, and against whom there is a strong feeling that we have too many of them—I am not surprised that such a remark was made, but I am sure the fact that he is an alien will make no difference in your determination to do justice between the prisoner and the country which at the present time is the country of his adoption; but as that suggestion has been made that you might be prejudiced against him as an alien, I think it is my duty, as a proof of the way in which English juries do act and the honesty they bring to bear, and the determination they have to do justice between man and man whatever the country they come from, I think it my duty to tell you that within a few weeks a jury found a verdict for £300 in favour of three Polish Jews in an action brought by them against

the Master Tailors; it was an action in which I was the judge. The English jury were prepared to do justice on their behalf and find against their countrymen for a considerable sum of money. Therefore I am certain, as in that action an English jury did justice to a foreigner, so in this case you will not allow any such feelings as have been suggested to bear on your minds.

Gentlemen, I have not gone through the evidence with you, because I have noticed the remarkable care you have taken in listening to the evidence, and asking questions on matters which required further explanation, and I think I should be insulting you if I read over the evidence to you. I will do so if any of you require it.

I must not forget to say a word of praise about the police force who had this matter in hand, and who have investigated it from the first moment that they had an inkling that anything was going on. Not one moment was allowed to elapse then, and it has been brought forward in as clear a form as any case of such difficulty could be.

Gentlemen, my task is over. I was going to say your task begins, but the painful part of your duty will be to say what your verdict will be. Think over the evidence which has been given and come to a proper conclusion in the case, namely, a clear conclusion if you can one way or the other, is the prisoner guilty or not? If there is any doubt in your minds, by all means give the prisoner the benefit of it. If you have no doubt about it, then, gentlemen, you have one duty, a painful one it must be, in the verdict you must find. Gentlemen, will you consider your verdict?

[The jury retired at five o'clock, and returned ten minutes later.]

The Clerk of Arraigns—Have you agreed upon your verdict?

The Foreman—We have. We find the prisoner guilty.

Sentence.

Mr. Justice Grantham—Severin Klosowski, for I decline to call you by the English name you have assumed, the only satisfactory feature in the case we have just completed is that

Sentence.

Mr Justice Grantham

I am able to address you as a foreigner and not as an Englishman. The jury have come to the only conclusion which I am sure every one who has heard the case would have come to. It is not necessary for me to go through the harrowing details of the case, or refer again to the frightful cruelty you have been guilty of in murdering year by year women on whom you have gratified your vile lust. I have but one duty to perform—and it is not necessary for me to say more—it is the duty of sentencing you to death.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

CORONER'S INQUEST.

First Sitting.

At the Southwark Coroner's Court, on Tuesday, 28th October, 1902, Dr. F. J. Waldo, the City and Southwark Coroner, opened an inquiry into the circumstances attending the death of Maud Eliza Marsh, aged nineteen, late barmaid at the Crown public-house, Borough High Street, who died on 22nd October.

George Chapman, who held the licence of the house, had been remanded in custody from the Southwark Police Court on the charge of causing the woman's death by administering arsenic to her.

Only evidence of identification was given by the girl's father, who said he understood that she was Mrs. Chapman.

The Coroner said the contents of the stomach would have to be analysed, and that he, therefore, proposed to adjourn the inquiry.

Second Sitting.

At the Southwark Coroner's Court, on Tuesday, 18th November, 1902, Dr. F. J. Waldo resumed his investigation into the circumstances attending the death of Maud Eliza Marsh.

The accused's second wife having died in somewhat similar circumstances, an order was issued for the exhumation of her body, which lay in St. Mary's Churchyard, Lymm, Cheshire.

The accused was present in the custody of two warders, and Mr. Sydney, solicitor, conducted his defence.

Mrs. Louisa Sarah Morris, a married sister of Marsh, living at Longfellow Road, Croydon, said she visited her sister when she was lying ill in Guy's Hospital in July or August, 1902. On one occasion when the accused returned from the hospital she asked what he thought of Maud, and he shook his head and remarked, "Very bad." In reply to questions, her sister said that she was married to the accused at a Roman Catholic room in Bishopsgate.

Replying to the coroner, the witness said she had suspected her sister's illness was connected with the accused. When she was in her bedroom at the Crown, about April, she heard from her sister that the accused had used medicines,

including frozen crystals smelling of carbolic and other appliances, to procure abortion. She advised her sister not to take the medicine. When her sister was in the hospital the witness asked the accused what was the matter with her. He said it was constipation, and added that she ought to have taken the medicine he gave her. The witness told him that she never would take medicine, and he said, "If she comes out of this lot she will do as I tell her." The witness observed, "It seems very funny that the doctors can't find out what she is suffering from," and the accused replied, "I could give her a bit like *that*" (holding up his forefinger and thumb) "and fifty doctors could not find out."

On one occasion when her sister was out walking with her, her sister began to cry because it was late. Asked why she was crying, she said, "You don't know what he is." In reply to questions, she added that the accused had beaten her more than once, taking hold of her hair and banging her head. She admitted that she retaliated by kicking him.

The witness stayed with her sister some time shortly before her death, and the accused frequently came into the room and felt her pulse. She refused to take the medicine sent by the doctor, saying that perhaps it was that which had made her retch, but she took one white powder which the doctor had sent. She improved after that, and began to take food and beef tea. On Sunday, 13th October, she had some roast pork and vegetables, having got better, and the accused spent an hour in the room alone with her. The witness asked the accused how Maud was, and he replied that he did not know. On going up to see her the witness, to her surprise, found her much worse. About a week later the witness and her mother visited Maud.

She remembered an occasion when she and her sister and the accused had tea together at the Crown. Her sister said, "What do you think? George says I won't live to be twenty-eight, or see twenty-eight." I said, "How does he know?" The accused replied, "No more you won't," or something of that kind. Maud said, "Remember I have been ill once, but this is a long liver" (pointing to herself). The witness and other members of the family visited whenever they liked, and had free entry to her. The accused and her sister seemed happy together. The appliances referred to were lying openly about the room.

By the Jury—When her sister left Guy's Hospital she seemed to be in the same condition as when she went in. From what Maud told her, the doctors wanted to make an examination, and the witness did not know whether the accused or her sister objected to it, but no examination was made.

By Mr. Sydney—Her sister refused to be operated upon.

Alice May Marsh, another sister, said that she had stayed with her sister at the Crown in July. After that visit she went again to the Crown, as the result of receiving a postcard, and the accused, in reply to her questions as to how Maud was, said, "She is in bed, dying hard." The witness later suggested to her sister that she should go to the hospital, and Maud said, "We must not let George see us go." They went to Guy's Hospital, and about half a dozen doctors examined her sister, who cried out with pain on being examined. The accused was cross when he knew what had been done, remarking that the doctors would only "mess her about." That morning Maud said the accused had given her something to drink, and had stood by her whilst she drank it. When her sister returned to the Crown, after being admitted to Guy's Hospital, the accused gave her something out of a silver paper, which she took and then asked for a drink. After her sister's death, the witness went to the Crown, and the accused remarked, "There is a chance now for you as a barmaid. Will you come?" She replied that a barmaid's place would not suit her.

Mrs. Jessie Toon, who nursed the deceased from 10th October until she died, said that the accused used to give her drugs. He prepared them himself. Accused always carried away the glass which had contained them and washed it. The accused told her to be careful what she said to Mrs. Marsh, and take particular notice of what Mrs. Marsh said to her, and to find out whether she thought there was anything wrong. On the day Miss Marsh died the witness gave her some brandy and water which the accused had brought up. On taking some of it Miss Marsh said, "No, no, no." Thinking it was too strong, witness tasted it, and it burned her lips so much that it made the tears come into her eyes. She washed her mouth out, and then diluted the liquid. The accused told her not to leave the room, as he would bring everything up. She did not say anything to the accused about the brandy and water.

By the Jury—The brandy and water tasted very different from the ordinary brandy and water. It tasted as if it had a foreign substance in it.

Third Sitting.

The inquiry relating to the death of Maud Eliza Marsh was resumed at the Southwark Coroner's Court on Tuesday, 25th November, 1902, by Dr. F. J. Waldo, the City and Southwark Coroner.

The accused was again present at the inquiry, and Mr. H. I. Sydney, solicitor, appeared on behalf of the accused.

Louisa Cole said she was employed by Mrs. Chapman as a domestic servant about four months previously. About three weeks before Mrs. Chapman died the witness bought a rabbit in the New Cut, Lambeth, and cooked it for the household. Mrs. Chapman, her master, and she ate some. It did not disagree with the witness or the others as far as she knew. The accused was in the habit of going into the kitchen for periods of from five minutes to half an hour, during which time she served in the bar. On one occasion she saw on the landing a half-pint tumbler full of white liquid. It was not milk. She saw the accused bring two glasses, one having a white liquid in it, into the kitchen. The witness went out of the kitchen, and on her return a little later found both glasses and a syringe had been taken away.

Frank L. Gilbert, mortuary-keeper in the service of the Borough Council, said he went to the Crown on the night of 22nd October to take the body away, on the order of Dr. Stoker. On stating his business, the accused said he wanted the body removed that night. It was eventually removed to the mortuary the next morning, and the accused appeared annoyed at this postponement. The accused said the body was that of his wife, and that he wanted the burial to take place as quietly as possible. He asked that it might take place from the mortuary, as he did not want any fuss made at the public-house.

Dr. J. H. Targett, obstetric surgeon at Guy's Hospital, said he first saw the girl Marsh on 28th July, and she remained at the hospital until 20th August. She said she had been married ten weeks. Referring to her condition, she said she suffered very severe pains in the lower part of the body, which came and went, and they were getting worse. He did not know that she had been an out-patient previously. While in the hospital she had a good deal of fever, and was exceedingly tender over the stomach, and as a consequence a proper examination could not be made. She was suffering from constipation. About 11th August the temperature, which had been as high as 106 degrees, came down to normal. Opiates had to be administered because of the pain, and after the fall of the temperature the pain subsided. The tenderness gradually passed away, and, her condition having greatly improved, she took her discharge. He never came to any conclusion as to the cause of her illness, but at one time he was of the opinion that she was suffering from peritonitis. It never entered his head that she might be suffering from an irritant poison.

Dr. James Morris Stoker, 221 New Kent Road, said that

he was first consulted about Maud Marsh on 10th October, when the accused called upon him and said she was suffering from diarrhœa and vomiting. He prescribed a mixture containing bismuth, opium, and chalk. At the accused's request he called at the Crown the same night, and found her suffering acutely. He called again on the following day, and every day for six days. He thought she had inflammation of the stomach and intestines. He suggested that she should go to hospital, but she began to cry. She said she had already been in Guy's. He told the accused that a nurse must be employed, and the accused said that he would get one. Later he gave bismuth powders, but, as she could not retain even these, he stopped them. He did not expect her death so soon.

He told the accused that he could not account for the cause of death, and would like a post-mortem examination. The accused said, "I do not see what use it would be." Afterwards the accused said that she died from exhaustion. Witness asked, "What caused the exhaustion?" and he said, "Diarrhœa and vomiting." The witness asked, "What caused those complaints?" but he made no answer.

He asked the Borough authorities' permission to remove the body to the mortuary for a private post-mortem examination. The body was removed, and he made the examination with the assistance of Dr. P. G. Cotter, of Caledonian Road, on 23rd October. Dr. French and Dr. Poirotte were also present. He found nothing abnormal about the body, and no cause of death. He removed the stomach and contents, and a portion of the liver and rectum, and placed them in bottles which had been cleansed with nitric acid and water. He sealed the bottles, and on the following morning took them to the Clinical Research Association, Southwark Street, where he handed them to Mr. Bodmer, an analyst and chemist. He asked him to test them for an irritant poison, suggesting arsenic.

By the Coroner—When did you first suspect your patient had taken arsenic?—I had no reason to suspect it until I made the post-mortem.

Why, not having these suspicions, did you make a post-mortem?—Because I could not account for the cause of death. I had a suspicion that there was something, but I could not say it was poison. I received a telegram from Dr. Grapel, of Croydon, with whom I had had a consultation the day before the death, telling me to look out for arsenic at the post-mortem examination. Not finding anything at the post-mortem examination made me suspect there was some other cause. The previous symptoms and the negative results of the post-mortem suggested arsenic in my opinion.

Continuing, the witness said he received the result of the analysis from the Clinical Research Association at about half-

past six on the Friday evening. It stated that Reinsch's test had been applied, and had discovered an appreciable amount of arsenic. Upon that he communicated with the police verbally, and with the coroner by post.

He first knew the accused in January, 1901, when he was called to his wife, Bessie, at the Monument public-house, Union Street, Borough. She had been attending his surgery some time before, suffering from symptoms which suggested dyspepsia. When he visited her later at the Monument the vomiting was very severe and quite uncontrollable. Then diarrhœa supervened. It was a serious case, and he had three consultations with different doctors. They all varied in their diagnoses. He (witness) and one other doctor thought it was due to some internal malignant disease. Death ensued, and he, being quite satisfied, gave a certificate. He did not consult anybody else about the death.

When he was called to Marsh, he was struck by the similarity of the symptoms in the two women. That and Dr. Grapel's telegram after the death of Marsh made him suspicious as to the two cases, and the result of the analysis strengthened his suspicions. On 10th October, when accused first called upon him and asked for some medicine for Marsh, he said he was not married to her, but she passed as Mrs. Chapman. When the witness first visited the girl the accused said she had been in Guy's Hospital, but the doctors had changed their opinion as to what was the matter with her several times. He could not remember if he said she was discharged from Guy's apparently cured. Marsh told the witness in the presence of the accused that one of the doctors had told her she was suffering from peritonitis. She added that they stopped giving her medicines and tried dieting her only. He prescribed first opium, catechu, and chalk for her, and as that had no effect he gave bismuth, ipecacuanha wine, and liquid morphia. He also gave morphia, opium, and beef-tea suppositories respectively at various times.

Did you give arsenic or antimony or any other such drug? —No.

Continuing, the witness said the patient's condition varied, and she was distinctly better when she did not have any food. For diet he prescribed soda water and milk, beef-tea, bovril, brandy, ice, and iced champagne by the mouth. He ordered injections of milk, egg, brandy, and beef-tea. He was satisfied with the nurse, Toon, but he had never seen her before. Marsh suffered a good deal from spasms in the legs, or rigidity of the muscles and of the lower part of the abdomen. The rigidity began with pain. He could not recollect whether the second Mrs. Chapman suffered from similar spasms. He did not tell the accused of the similarity of the symptoms of the two women. He believed the nurse, Toon, suggested

that the cause of the vomiting was the rabbit. That was about two days before the death. As to the post-mortem examination, the accused did not raise any strong objection to it; he merely said he did not see what use it would be. The accused, on the day of the death, appeared to be very much concerned about it.

By the JURY—He could not say whether the medicines he gave were administered.

Dr. FRANCIS GASPAR GRAPEL, 282 London Road, Croydon, said that Mr. Marsh (the deceased's father) consulted him about the girl on 21st October, and asked him to attend her at the Crown. He went in the afternoon and saw the accused. He explained that he had come to meet Dr. Stoker in consultation, but the accused did not appear to know anything about it. He told him that he had been asked to come by Mr. Marsh, and the accused said there was already one doctor in attendance. The witness then asked for Mrs. Marsh, who was helping to nurse her daughter, and the accused said something about "fifty doctors," but witness did not catch the full sentence. The accused then fetched Mrs. Marsh, and the witness explained that there had evidently been a muddle. Dr. Stoker was sent for at the witness's request, and they consulted both before and after an examination of the patient. On examination the first thing that struck him was the peculiar colour of the skin generally, which was of a "dirty jaundice" complexion. The tongue and mouth were very dry, and the patient was semi-comatose. The breathing was very shallow, but the pulse was fairly good and regular, whilst the heart, considering her general condition, was beating very well. The temperature was rather high. He formed the opinion that she was suffering from ptomaine poisoning, there being a story of a rabbit having been eaten. He was also told—by Mrs. Marsh, he believed—that the servant had vomited after eating the rabbit. The witness saw Mrs. Marsh and told her that her daughter was suffering from an irritant poison, which might be ptomaine. After leaving the house he changed his opinion, and he became convinced, after thinking the matter over, that it was arsenic poison. He came to that conclusion because the symptoms were intermittent. In ptomaine poisoning the patient would either get better or worse. He was surprised when he heard that death had taken place so soon, in view of her strong condition when he saw her.

Fourth Sitting.

Dr. F. J. Waldo, the City and Southwark Coroner, concluded his inquiry on Thursday, 18th December, 1902.

The accused man, George Chapman, was again present.

Detective-Inspector GODLEY produced a large number of medical and scientific works, including the Pharmacopœia, a Latin Pharmacopœia, several volumes of the "Family Physician," "A Practice of Physics," &c., which he found at the Crown when he searched the premises. He also discovered a copy of Aristotle's Works, a book written by James Berry, describing his experiences as an executioner, and a stethoscope. In one of the medical books was a label bearing the name of W. H. Davidson, a dispensing chemist of Hastings, and the words, "Tartar-emetic poisoning." He made inquiries to find if Marsh had been insured, but he could not find that she had.

The witness described the arrest of the accused at the Crown on 25th October, when he said, "I don't know anything about it; I don't know how she got the poison. She has been in Guy's Hospital for the same sort of sickness." The witness accompanied him to the bedroom on the second floor, the door of which the accused unlocked. The witness said he should take charge of all the medicine bottles in the room, whereupon the accused stooped down, picked up some bottles, and handed them to the witness. In a drawer £268 10s. in gold and notes was found. At the police station, before the charge had been entered, the accused asked for bail, but the witness told him it was too serious a matter to allow it. The accused observed, "She did not die suddenly; if she had been poisoned she would have done." At 10.15 on the same night the witness told the accused it was his duty to charge him with the wilful murder of Maud Marsh by poisoning her with arsenic. The accused remarked, "I am innocent."

Mrs. MARSH, Maud's mother, recalled, said that on the early morning of her daughter's death the accused brought up some brandy in a small glass. Maud awoke about four o'clock, and the witness gave her some of the brandy in some soda water. She vomited immediately afterwards. The witness drank some of the brandy about half an hour later, and about two hours later she felt bad and was seized with violent pains. She did not notice anything peculiar about the taste or smell of the brandy.

Mrs. JESSIE TOON, recalled, said that when she arrived at the house on the morning of the death she asked the accused how Maud was. He said she was worse, and, laughing, added, "The old mother is bad now."

Dr. L. FREYBERGER, Regent's Park Road, N.W., pathologist to the London County Council, said he made a post-mortem examination of the body on 30th October, in the presence

Mr. Cecil Chapman.

of other medical men. The skin was of a yellowish green hue and bloodless, but there was no eruption about the body. The gums and tongue were pale, but there was no line of discoloration about the gums. In answer to the coroner, the witness said that the post-mortem examination was inconclusive. Beyond the dryness of the skin and one or two other little matters there was nothing tangible. There was no combination of causes to account for the death.

Dr. Stevenson, Home Office analyst, read his report of the analysis, repeating the evidence given at the inquiry at Southwark Police Court on 12th December.[1] It was difficult to say what a fatal dose of tartar-emetic was; but he had come to the conclusion that 15 grains was an average fatal dose, while the amount found in the various organs was 20.12 grains. An ordinary person would not tolerate more than 3 grains; 1 or 2 grains were a very sure emetic; a person with inflammation of the lungs could take more. A grain or two given continuously would have a very bad effect. He was of opinion that Marsh took a large dose not many hours before death, seeing the quantity that was found in the bowel. He could not say from the fact that antimony was found in the tissues that it had been taken over a long period of time, because if a person took only one big dose it would be distributed throughout all the tissues. Taking the results of the post-mortem examination, the analysis, and the symptoms of excessive vomiting and purging, he had no doubt that death was due to antimonial poisoning. Antimony depressed the heart and affected the pulse. It had a sweetish astringent taste which could be covered by food or liquor. He had examined thirty or forty medicine bottles found at the Crown. In the drains of one of the bottles bearing Dr. Stoker's label he found a relatively large quantity of antimony. He analysed a white powder which Dr. Stoker identified as having been supplied by him, and found it to be a bismuth powder free from arsenic and antimony. He considered death due to acute antimonial poisoning. In reply to further questions, the witness said that metallic antimony passed through the body unchanged.

Dr. James Henry Targett, obstetric surgeon at Guy's Hospital, recalled, said the symptoms he noticed in Marsh when she was an in-patient agreed with those that would be caused by antimonial poisoning. There were, however, at that time no very striking symptoms.

Dr. James Morris Stoker, recalled, said the symptoms he noticed when attending the girl were consistent with anti-

[1] See Police Court Proceedings.

monial poisoning. None of the medicines he prescribed for the girl contained antimony or arsenic. He did not keep antimony in his surgery, but he did have arsenic. He prescribed sub-nitrate of bismuth powers.

By Mr. SYDNEY—He did not form the opinion that death had resulted from antimony until he had heard the result of Dr. Stevenson's analysis.

Dr. F. GRAPEL, Croydon, recalled, said that the symptoms produced by arsenic and antimony were very similar. When in consultation with Dr. Stoker on the day before the death they came to the conclusion that Marsh was suffering from ptomaine poisoning. He formed the arsenic theory after the consultation.

RICHARD BODMER, public analyst to the borough of Bermondsey, and consulting chemist to the Clinical Research Association, Southwark Street, said he received sealed bottles containing the stomach and a small portion of the liver from Dr. Stoker, who asked to have them examined for arsenic. Dr. Stoker asked for a report the same day. Witness applied Reinsch's test, and found almost immediately arsenic crystals and evidence of antimony; but, as there was not time to make the full test for the latter poison, he reported the presence of arsenic only the same night. Subsequently he made a corroborative analysis by Marsh's test, and found a much larger quantity of antimony than arsenic. He assisted Dr. Stevenson in his analysis, and agreed absolutely with him as to the results.

FLORENCE RAYNER and Inspector GODLEY, recalled, repeated the evidence previously given at the police court.[2]

The CORONER, in summing up the case to the jury, remarked that Dr. Stoker was ill-advised in making a private post-mortem examination. He would have been better advised, if, when he formed his suspicions, he had referred the case to him (the coroner). Still, as it had happened, his action did not appear to have made any difference to the case. Dr. Grapel was the first one to call attention to arsenic, and if it had not been for him perhaps they would never have heard of the case. His telegram to Dr. Stoker to look out for arsenic at the private post-mortem examination did a great deal of good. Having reviewed the evidence, he remarked that the inquiry resolved itself into their answering two questions—(1) What, in their opinion, was the cause of death? and if they were of opinion, as they must be, that it was due to antimonial poisoning, then (2)

[2] See Police Court Proceedings.

how and by whom, in their opinion, was the poison administered? They had to consider whether Marsh took the poison herself for any illegal purpose, or to commit suicide, or whether any person or persons administered it. If they found on the evidence, which was circumstantial, that the accused administered it with intention to kill, then it would be their duty to return a verdict of wilful murder against him. But if they thought the evidence against him was not sufficient, then they could say that death was due to antimonial poisoning, but there was not sufficient evidence for them to come to the conclusion that he had administered it.

The JURY, after an absence of twenty minutes from the Court, returned and announced that they had come to the conclusion that the death of Maud Eliza Marsh was caused by antimonial poisoning, and that the poison was administered by George Chapman.

The CORONER—You have found a *prima facie* case against him?

The FOREMAN—Yes.

A verdict of "wilful murder" was returned against the accused, and he was committed to take his trial at the Old Bailey on the coroner's inquest.

APPENDIX II.

POLICE COURT PROCEEDINGS.

Monday, 27th October, 1902.

At Southwark Police Court, before Mr. Paul Taylor, George Chapman, thirty-six, licensed victualler, of the Crown public-house, 213 Borough High Street, was in custody charged with feloniously killing and slaying Maud Marsh, aged twenty, who had been cohabiting with him, by administering arsenic to her on 22nd October.

Mr. Sydney appeared for the defence.

After the accused's arrest, the Crown was searched, and the police found several books relating to medicines and drugs, some white powders which had not yet been analysed, £143 10s. in gold, £15 in silver, sixteen £5 notes, and three £10 notes. The police further discovered undertakers' bills relating to the burial of the accused's late wife, who died on 13th February, 1901, and a Mary Isabella Chapman, aged forty-one, who died in 1897.

Maud Marsh was attended by Dr. J. Morris Stoker, of 221 New Kent Road, for diarrhœa and sickness. His suspicions were aroused by the fact that the symptoms were the same as in the case of the accused's wife, in which, after three consultations, he certified that death was due to diarrhœa, vomiting, and exhaustion. He requested the accused to engage a nurse, and Jessie Toon, of 23 Eltham Street, Borough, was called in. A servant in the public-house said she had heard that the diarrhœa was the result of eating some rabbit about three weeks previously. She had some of it and found it nice; and it did not affect her. Marsh could not take food in the ordinary way. Four days after the doctor was called in, and it was alleged that the accused gave the injections himself. Marsh died on 22nd October, and Dr. Stoker insisted on a post-mortem examination. He was assisted by Dr. P. G. Cotter, of 57 Caledonian Road, Islington, and no satisfactory cause of death could be found. A portion of the stomach was sent to the Borough analyst, who certified that he had discovered an "appreciable quantity of arsenic." Maud Marsh had advertised about fourteen months previously in the *Morning Advertiser* for a situation as barmaid, and the accused replied. After a short time he asked her how she would like to be Mrs. Chapman. Her father understood that she was married.

Police Court Proceedings.

Detective-Inspector GODLEY, M Division, said that, from information which came to him, he and Detective-Sergeant Kemp went to the Crown public-house on the 25th inst. and saw the accused in the bar.

Is he the holder of the licence?—Yes. The witness, continuing, said he asked accused if he was Mr. Chapman. The accused replied, "Yes," and he remarked, "I am an inspector of police, and wish to speak to you quietly." They went to the end of the billiard room, and the witness said, "Maud Marsh, who has been living with you as your wife, has been poisoned by arsenic, and from the surrounding circumstances I shall take you to the police station while I make inquiries about the case." He (the accused) observed, "I know nothing about it. I do not know how she got the poison. She has been in Guy's Hospital for the same sort of sickness." He was taken to the station and detained. At 10.15 p.m. the witness said to him, "From inquiries I have made, it is now my duty to charge you with the wilful murder of Maud Marsh." He replied, "I am innocent. Can you let me have bail?"

By Mr. TAYLOR—When did the woman die?—On the 22nd inst.

In hospital?—No, at his residence. I may add that from inquiries I found that he was the only person who used to feed her, and would not allow any other person in the kitchen while he made the food. He has had three deaths in five years—two Mrs. Chapmans and Marsh.

The inquest is to-morrow?—Yes. I found five medical books in the house and five white powders, which have not been analysed at present.

Have you any medical evidence?—Yes. I have seen the certificate of analysis, which states that arsenic was found. The doctor who attended Marsh also attended Mrs. Chapman, who died on 13th February, 1901, at the Monument public-house, Union Street. The sickness was so identical that the doctor was suspicious, and he is now of opinion that the woman who died at the Monument public-house was poisoned.

This is a case that may require three or four remands?—It may require a dozen if we have to exhume these bodies.

[Mr. Taylor then remanded the accused for eight days.]

Mr. SYDNEY asked for bail. He said there was really no evidence against the accused, except what had been stated by the inspector. He was a licence-holder, and there had been an absolute denial of the charge on his part from the beginning.

Inspector GODLEY—I object to bail. There is nothing to stop this man from quitting the country. He came from America in 1893, and there is nothing whatever to keep him

here. He has no banking account, but between £200 and £300 in notes and gold were found at his premises.

Mr. TAYLOR—I shall not grant bail.

Mr. SYDNEY—With regard to the money found in the house, of course, the police have no right to that.

Inspector GODLEY said he had no objection to handing over any sum mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR—I consider that all the money ought to be handed over. In a charge of this kind it is essential that the man should have the money for the purposes of his own defence. It is not a question of robbery in this case.

Tuesday, 4th November, 1902.

At Southwark Police Court, on 4th November, 1902, the accused, George Chapman, was brought before Mr. Cecil Chapman, who heard the remainder of the proceedings, owing to the absence of Mr. Paul Taylor on holiday.

Detective-Inspector GODLEY asked for a formal remand.

Mr. NAIRN (chief clerk)—Until what day?

Inspector GODLEY—Any day that suits the Court.

Mr. NAIRN—Will to-morrow week do?

Inspector GODLEY—Yes.

Wednesday, 12th November, 1902.

At Southwark Police Court, on Wednesday, 12th November, 1902, before Mr. Cecil Chapman, George Chapman again appeared charged on remand with killing Maud Marsh.

Mr. Bodkin and Mr. Sims appeared for the prosecution on behalf of the Treasury, and Mr. Sydney, solicitor, defended.

Mr. BODKIN said that, so far as that day's proceedings were concerned, he did not propose to open the case or to give any evidence which might be called controversial, for the reason that there was another inquiry proceeding, and he could not help thinking somewhat unfortunately proceeding, contemporaneously with the magisterial inquiry, and that inquiry was not bound by the ordinary rules of evidence. He thought it would be in favour of the defendant himself if the gentleman (Dr. Waldo) conducting that inquiry either completed it according to his discretion, or adjourned it until this inquiry was finished; but, however that might be, he proposed briefly to examine Mr. Marsh, the father of the girl, and possibly Mrs. Marsh in part, and then to ask for a remand over the next week for the purpose not only of giving an opportunity for that other inquiry to be completed, but also for the purpose of completing certain matters of inquiry which the prosecution desired to be finished before they put the case fully before the magistrate.

Police Court Proceedings.

Robert Marsh, father of Maud Marsh, having repeated the evidence he had given at the inquest the previous day,[1] said that on 21st October he saw Dr. Grapel, of Croydon, and that gentleman visited the girl. Later in the day the witness called at the Crown.

By Mr. Bodkin—Did the accused say anything about Dr. Grapel's visit?—He said, "If one doctor cannot cure her, fifty cannot." He said he did not like the idea of Dr. Grapel's calling.

By the Magistrate—What reply did you make?—I said, "It is no good making a bother; I wished the doctor to come."

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—From first to last did your daughter and the accused live on the best of terms together? I have had no complaints.

There was never any friction, so far as you saw?—No.

During the time of her illness, did the accused give you and the other members of your family every information?

The Magistrate—That is rather a difficult question. If you ask him whether the accused answered the questions put to him——

Mr. Sydney—I put it further than that—that he volunteered information.

The Magistrate—He gave them such information as they received, but there might be other information which was not given.

Cross-examination continued—I will put it in another form. I think you made inquiries about your daughter's health. Did he answer frankly?—Yes.

Did you know she was ordered iced water?—Yes.

Did the accused appear upset on 21st October?—No.

Friday, 28th November, 1902.

Mrs. Eliza Marsh, 14 Longfellow Road, West Croydon, repeated the evidence already given as to accompanying her daughter to the Monument public-house, of which the accused was then landlord, in response to an advertisement inserted by the accused for a barmaid. She noticed that the accused was wearing a wedding ring, and she asked if he was a widower. He replied in the affirmative, and after further conversation said Miss Marsh would suit him nicely. A short time after the girl took up the situation the witness visited the public-house, and the accused remarked that he liked her daughter.

Did he use any other word instead of "like"?—I cannot

[1] See Coroner's Inquest.

exactly say. He said he had taken her about, and asked to be engaged to her.

Did you agree to it there and then?—I said I would ask her father about it. Proceeding, the witness narrated the incident of the will being made by the accused in favour of the girl, and said that in consequence of receiving letters from her daughters she visited her on Sunday, 13th September, 1901. Confetti was lying "all over the place," and the girl said she had been married that morning.

What did the accused say then?—"Come and have some dinner."

Was your daughter wearing a wedding ring?—Yes.

On being further examined, Mrs. Marsh said she attended upon her daughter on several occasions during her illness. She asked Dr. Stoker if he could do anything to stop her daughter's sickness. He said, "I am at my wits' end to know what to do with her; my means are exhausted."

Did the accused come in now and again to see how she was getting on?—He came in every few minutes.

Did your daughter make some statement as to what she attributed her illness to? Did she mention anything which she had taken?—Yes; and I asked the accused if he thought the rabbit of which she had eaten part was the cause of the illness.

What did he say?—He said he could not tell, or he did not know. He also said they all had some of the rabbit. I stayed with my daughter all that night.

The next day did you say anything to Dr. Stoker?—I suggested calling in my own medical man, Dr. Grapel, of Croydon.

And he agreed?—Yes. I stayed all that day and night. The next morning I was suffering from sickness and diarrhœa myself. I noticed a change in my daughter's condition, and saw that she was dying.

Did she say anything shortly before she died?—She said, "I am going."

Was the accused in the room then?—Yes.

Did he say anything?—Yes. "Where are you going?"

Did your daughter say something to the accused before she died?—"Good-bye, George." Then she died.

Did he remain in the room?—He closed her eyes and then went on the landing.

Did you see what he did?—He cried.

Did you tell the accused anything about a conversation you had with Dr. Grapel?—I told him Dr. Grapel said she was poisoned.

Did the accused say anything to that?—He said he did not know how, unless it was the rabbit.

Did you make any reply?—I said, "Dr. Grapel says you do not find arsenic in rabbit."

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—My daughter had been out of a situation for two months before she became barmaid to the accused. I, as a mother, made all the inquiries I could to satisfy myself that the place was respectable. From the very first the accused was attentive. My daughter was ill at the Monument for three days, but not sufficiently to keep her in bed.

When in conversation with your daughter at the hospital did you ever hear her make an objection to being examined by doctors. I did not hear it myself, but she told my married daughter so. The accused fetched her away from the hospital because she was going to be examined.

Because she did not like it?—Because he strongly objected to it. She said George said she was not to have an examination. When she wrote telling him she would have to be examined he took her away in a cab.

Mrs. Louisa Sarah Morris, married sister of Maud Marsh, gave evidence of visiting the girl at the hospital and afterwards at the public-house. On one occasion the witness remarked to the accused, "Don't you think it is funny that Maud is like this?" He replied, "It is constipation." She said, "That is funny, because I saw her a short time before and she had diarrhœa." He observed, "She should have done as I have told her, taken the medicine I gave her." She said, "Maud would never take medicine." "If she comes out of this lot," retaliated the accused, "she will do as I tell her." She then remarked, "It seems very funny that the doctors cannot find out what is the matter with her." He made a gesture and replied, "I could give her a bit like that, and fifty doctors could not find out." "What do you mean?" she demanded, but he did not answer. The witness repeated the evidence she gave at the inquest as to staying with her sister at the Crown, and again related the story of the pork dinner and ginger beer which, although taken by the girl when she was so ill, was not vomited. For some time afterwards she was better. The witness was away from her for an hour, the accused having seen her in the meantime. The accused afterwards came to her and asked, "Are you cold?" She replied, "No; how is Maud?" He said, "I do not know." She went upstairs and found her sister very bad. She was very thirsty, and she had some ginger beer. She also had some champagne, which the accused brought. These were vomited. The accused frequently entered the room each time taking Maud's hand and feeling her pulse.

Cross-examined—The witness said her sister never told her

that she did not like being "messed about" by doctors. The witness heard that a surgical operation was suggested while her sister was in hospital, and Maud Marsh told her that the accused objected to her going under an operation or any examination.

When he snapped his fingers and said something about fifty doctors not being able to find out, was he in a temper?—He was the same as I have always seen him.

In an ordinary temper?—Yes.

While you were in attendance did your sister have everything necessary?—She had what she wanted.

Alice May Marsh, another sister, repeated her evidence of calling at the Crown in consequence of receiving a postcard to the effect that the accused was ill. She was surprised to see the accused in the bar, and, after telling him so, asked for her sister. The accused said, "She's in bed, dying fast." The witness visited the public-house again on the day after her sister's death. At tea the accused said, "There's a chance for you as barmaid now, Alice; will you come?" "No, thanks," she replied, "London does not suit me."

Daisy Harriet Helen Marsh, the youngest sister, again told of a visit to the Monument public-house at the time of the alleged marriage.

Mrs. Jessie Toon, charwoman, of 23 Eltham Street, Borough, said she was engaged by the accused to nurse Maud Marsh. The unfortunate woman vomited frequently, and the accused injected what he said was beef tea and milk, but she never saw him mix the food. One or two injections were made a day. Maud Marsh would not take the medicine. Sometimes she appeared to have fits, and her limbs became rigid—she was in such pain. She was always thirsty and used to ask for water, but the accused gave her brandy. On the morning of the girl's death the accused brought up some brandy and water. The witness tasted it, and it burnt her mouth and throat.

Friday, 5th December, 1902.

Mrs. Marsh, recalled and examined by Mr. Bodkin—I want you to take your mind back to the early morning of 21st October, the day your daughter died. About one o'clock, just after Jessie Toon had left, did the accused enter the room?—Yes.

Did he bring anything with him?—He said my daughter would want a little something for the night, and he placed a pony glass of brandy by the side of the bed.

She slept part of the night?—Yes, she had a good sleep. When she awoke I gave her some of the brandy mixed with soda water.

Did she vomit it?—Yes, that was the last time she was sick.

What did you do with the remainder of the brandy?—I put a little iced water with it and drank it myself.

Some little time after that, what happened to you?—I was taken very sick.

How long after you had taken it?—About two hours. I was taken with sickness and diarrhœa very bad. I had to leave my daughter, and while I was away the accused was with her.

Did you tell the accused about yourself?—Yes.

What did he say?—That it was through sitting up so long.

The witness said that later her daughter wanted something to drink, and Jessie Toon offered her some more brandy, which the accused had brought up. Maud Marsh refused it with a gesture, and asked for some water. Some water was given her. The witness thought that her daughter was dying, as she was black round her mouth. Some cloth which was removed was saturated with a discharge, which was green in colour.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—One of the things the doctor ordered your daughter was brandy?—Yes.

Have you ever mentioned before that you tasted the brandy on 22nd October?—No.

Were you in the habit of taking brandy?—No.

Have you been told about Jessie Toon's statement with regard to some brandy?—No. I know she tasted it. I thought I told Inspector Godley about it, but he says I did not.

It is only after you have had some conversation with Inspector Godley that you say the brandy caused the diarrhœa?—I do not say it caused the diarrhœa.

But you suggested it?—It followed it. I did not think at the time that the brandy caused my illness.

Mrs. Jessie Toon, the charwoman who nursed Maud Marsh for a time, was also recalled and examined by Mr. Bodkin. She said on the morning of 22nd October she left her patient at one o'clock. At half-past eight she returned in consequence of a message.

Did you ask anything of the accused?—Yes. I asked him if Maud Marsh was worse, and he said, "No, her mother is bad now."

Did you ask what was the matter with her?—Yes, and he said, "Diarrhœa and sickness." I said, "What, two of them now!" and he replied, "You had better go upstairs

and tell her to get to bed out of the way, the old cat." On the Thursday I again saw the accused. I said, "Is it true that Mrs. Chapman has gone away?" but he would not answer.

Up to that time you had not been paid anything?—No.

On the 24th did you again go to the Crown?—Yes, the accused asked me what he was in my debt. I said, "Are you satisfied with me?" and he replied, "Perfectly. You did all you could." He asked me if I would do some washing for him on the following Tuesday. I said he ought to have had the clothes and dirty things washed the day after she died, because they smelt nasty. He said, "I have destroyed them." He said he would not give me any spirits to drink, although I deserved the best in the house, because when I had spirits I talked.

During the illness did Maud Marsh complain of anything?—On the Sunday before she died she said her mouth and throat burned, and that they seemed to be on fire. On 20th October the accused brought a stethoscope into the room. He first felt the pulse of the girl Marsh, then pulled her eyelids up and examined her eyes, afterwards putting the stethoscope to her heart and listening for two minutes. She had never seen him use the stethoscope before, or examine her eyes.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—Maud Marsh, as well as the accused, wished her to act as nurse. She was told that the food had to be injected, and said that she did not know how to do it.

Did you at any time administer an injectment?—Certainly not.

Was not that because you were not able to?—He did not want me to. I asked him, but he would not show me how to mix the food.

Did you not try to do it on one occasion?—Certainly not.

Did you mention to the accused or the doctor about the brandy burning your throat?—No.

Why not to the doctor?—Mrs. Chapman mentioned it to the doctor herself, and so saved me the trouble. He got a teaspoon, looked at her throat, and said it was raw.

With regard to the spirits and talking—talking has got you into trouble?—Yes.

Louisa Beatrice Cole, domestic servant, repeated the evidence she gave at the inquest as to what she saw at the Crown while she was servant there from July until after the death of Maud Marsh. She recalled the Sunday when they had rabbit, which was bought in the New Cut, for dinner. It did not have any effect upon her, or, as far as she knew, upon any of the others. On 7th October, after dinner, the girl Marsh, who had eaten cold potatoes only, was sick. Marsh was very seldom sick at this time.

Dr. James Henry Targett, assistant obstetric surgeon at Guy's Hospital, said Marsh was admitted to the hospital on 28th July. She complained of pain in the abdomen, and it was not possible to make a complete examination at first because of extreme tenderness. She was very bad during the first fortnight, and opiates had to be administered frequently to control the pain. She had a feverish, rapid pulse, and the average temperature was 103. On one occasion the temperature was 104.6, but after 11th August it gradually fell. Sickness was never a marked symptom, but merely occasional. He thought she was suffering from peritonitis. Before she left the hospital he thought she might be suffering from tuberculosis. The possibility of any irritant poison never presented itself to his mind.

Cross-examined—Marsh was very much better when she left the hospital, and left with the consent of the doctor. He prescribed for her light food, opiates for pain, and on some occasions aperients.

Louisa Cole, who was again recalled, continuing her evidence, described how the accused mixed the food by pouring it from one glass to another.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—Maud Marsh sent for the rabbit, and I cooked it in the usual way. After the nurse (Toon) came I only went into the bedroom where the girl was twice to clean it.

Have you spoken to Toon about the evidence you were going to give?—No.

And there were only you, Toon, and the accused in the house?—Yes.

Do you say that what he was pouring from one glass to another was white?—No, brown.

If you said so at the inquest you made a mistake?—Yes. During the time I was at the house the accused and the girl Marsh appeared to be on affectionate terms.

Frank Gilbert, mortuary-keeper in charge of the mortuary at the back of St. George's Church, Borough, where the post-mortem examinations were made, repeated his statement as to Dr. Stoker first attending, and afterwards Dr. Stevenson and Dr. Freyberger, to examine the girl.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—Dr. Stoker made his examination at the mortuary without authority from the coroner. This was very unusual, but the witness understood that Dr. Stoker received permission from the clerk in the medical department of the Southwark Borough Council.

Joseph Henry Vaughan Marks, 31 Gaywood Street, the coroner's officer for Southwark, said that on 25th October

he received some information, and in company with Detective-Sergeant Kemp he visited Dr. Stoker. Then on 30th October he went to the premises of the Clinical Research Association, Southwark Street, and received three jars containing something from Dr. Bodmer. He kept them in his possession until 30th October, when he handed them to Dr. Stevenson.

Dr. Francis Gaspar Grapel, London Road, West Croydon, said he was medical attendant to the Marshes, and on 23rd October he visited Maud Marsh. He first saw the accused, who gave him the impression that he did not know anything about his attending. On the 24th, having considered the case, and heard of the death, he sent a telegram to Dr. Stoker. He was surprised to find that she had died so suddenly. On the Tuesday he had come to the conclusion that the symptoms pointed to arsenical poisoning. The accused made no objection to his making an examination of the girl. He had not had much experience with regard to arsenical poisoning. In the first instance, he expressed an opinion that it was probably due to ptomaine poisoning. There was some resemblance between the symptoms of ptomaine and arsenical poisoning, but there were several points of difference. In the first place, the symptoms in repeated doses of arsenic would be intermittent, while with ptomaine the symptoms would be continuous. The attacks would be intermittent in cases of mineral poisons.

Friday, 12th December, 1902.

Dr. James Morris Stoker, 221 New Kent Road, examined by Mr. Bodkin, said that the accused called at his surgery on 10th October and said the woman was suffering from diarrhœa and vomiting. He said that she had been in Guy's Hospital about a month, and asked for a bottle of medicine. He said she was not actually Mrs. Chapman, but she passed as such. The witness prescribed some medicine, and made arrangements to call at the Crown later. He visited the woman in the evening, and gave instructions for a milk diet, a little beef tea, a little brandy as a stimulant, and some ice to suck. The constituents of the medicine were chalk, catechu, and bismuth. The next day he called again and found that she was not any better. He did not remember whether the accused said she was cured when she left Guy's Hospital.

Was anything said by her in the accused's presence?—She said the doctor told her she had been suffering from peritonitis. On the Sunday she was much better, and he changed the medicine to morphia, bismuth, and bicarbonate of soda.

The next day she was worse again, and on the sixth day (Wednesday) he stopped all feeding by the mouth.

Did you form any opinion at that time?—I was changing my mind. I thought she might have some gastric irritation.

Continuing, witness said he told the accused a nurse would be required. He first told him that it would be better if the woman went to the hospital. The woman began to cry, and said something leading the witness to suppose that she did not want to go. The accused remarked, "She won't go." On the Thursday, as she still vomited, the bismuth powders, which had been given as a sedative to the stomach, were stopped. On the 17th Jessie Toon was there as nurse, and he gave her certain directions as to the injections. The symptoms still continued, and he could not ascribe the colour and character of the vomit to any definite cause. She had great pain in the stomach, and the muscles of the limbs became rigid. By the Sunday she was getting very weak. When he called on the 22nd and found the woman dead the accused's eyes were red, and he was rubbing them. In reply to a question, the accused, in a broken tone, said, "She died at twelve o'clock." The witness, having regard to her condition on the night before, was surprised at her death. He told the accused that he could not understand the cause of all this diarrhœa and vomiting, and that he would like a post-mortem examination. The accused replied, "I do not see the good of it." The witness said to Mrs. Marsh, "I shall have a post-mortem. I cannot give a death certificate." The accused said she died from exhaustion following diarrhœa and vomiting. The witness asked what caused these symptoms, but he did not reply. The witness said he only wanted a private examination just to see the intestines, and that he could have the body back when he liked.

Further questioned, the witness said that in due course the body was removed to Southwark mortuary, and he made the examination. The heart, lungs, and liver were healthy, and an external view of the intestines and stomach did not reveal the cause of death. He placed certain parts of the intestines in glass bottles, which he afterwards took to Dr. Bodmer, of the Clinical Research Association. Upon receiving a communication from Dr. Bodmer, he communicated with the police and coroner. The three bottles produced originally came from his surgery, and had contained medicine he had prescribed for the woman. One of them contained a mixture he had already mentioned. The constituents of the second were bicarbonate of soda, prussic acid, and some sweetening and colouring matter, and the third was ordinary opium and water.

In any medicines you prescribed for Maud Marsh was there any antimony?—No.

Do you keep any in your house?—No.

Do you know when you last had any?—I have never prescribed it.

How long have you been in this house?—Ten years.

So you have had none for the last ten years?—No.

Was there any arsenic in any of the medicines?—No.

Do you keep any in your surgery?—Yes.

Referring again to the antimony, was there any preparation of antimony of any kind, shape, or form, chloride or sulphide, in any of the medicines?—No.

During your attendance on Maud Marsh was there ever present in your mind the possibility of some irritant poison causing the symptoms?—No.

Did the appearance of the body at the post-mortem examination present to your mind such a possibility?—Finding nothing to account for death presented to my mind the possibility of something.

By the negative evidence?—Yes.

This might be important later. The bottles in which you removed part of the intestines were previously chemically cleaned. What were they cleaned with?—Nitrate acid.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney, the witness said that during the time he attended upon the woman there were no objective signs. He tried to find out what caused the symptoms, but could not come to any conclusion. The accused never objected to the post-mortem examination, except when he said that he did not see the good of it.

Why did you not communicate with the coroner in the first instance?—I did as soon as I could.

You know the death took place on the 22nd?—I knew what the woman died of.

Then why did you not give a certificate?—I wanted to know what caused the diarrhœa and vomiting.

Do you not know, as a medical practitioner, that, if you cannot give a certificate of death, you should communicate with the coroner at once?—Yes. I knew that the woman died from diarrhœa and vomiting, but I wanted to find out for my own personal information what caused those symptoms.

Would not ipecacuanha cause sickness?—In large doses, yes; in small doses, no.

Would not the extent of the dose largely depend upon the state of the stomach?—If you take a small dose it stops vomiting. Ipecacuanha is one of the medicines for sickness.

But it might be used as an emetic?—Yes, in large doses.

Richard Bodmer, fellow of the Institute of Chemistry, public analyst to the borough of Bermondsey, and consulting chemist to the Clinical Research Association, who was examined by Mr. Bodkin, said that on Friday, 24th October,

he received two jars from Dr. Stoker at the laboratory of the Clinical Research Association, 1 Southwark Street. They were both sealed. One contained a human stomach and a small piece of liver, and the other some parts of the bowel and small pieces of liver. He had some conversation with Dr. Stoker.

Did you take a small portion of the fluid in the stomach and apply to it what is known as Reinsch's test?—Yes.

Is that a well-known test to discover thereby arsenic?—Yes.

Did you discover arsenic?—Yes.

In the course of the test were some copper slips used?—Yes.

Did you notice anything afterwards?—I noticed that the copper slips were covered with a purplish tint.

What did that denote?—It suggested the presence of antimony.

The witness, proceeding, said he then acquainted Dr. Stoker with the result of his analysis, and on the Monday following he received a visit from Detective-Inspector Godley. He then applied Marsh's test—a standard test for arsenic—to another portion of the fluid, and the presence of arsenic was discovered. He also discovered the presence of antimony. He was of opinion from Marsh's test that the amount of antimony far exceeded that of arsenic.

Dr. Thomas Stevenson, one of the official analysts to the Home Office, examined by Mr. Bodkin, said that on 30th October last, by arrangement, he attended at St. George's mortuary. There were also present Dr. Freyberger, Dr. Stoker, and Dr. Cotter. Under his directions and superintendence a post-mortem examination was made by Dr. Freyberger upon Maud Marsh. The body was that of an apparently anæmic young woman. He could find from the condition of the organs no natural disease to account for death. He found she had suffered from inflammation of the mucous membrane of the bowels. Coupling that with a dryness of the tissues, he came to the conclusion that she had had a great drain upon the fluids of the body, probably from severe diarrhœa. The appearance of the body pointed, not very conclusively, however, to death from some irritant metallic poisoning. He knew the rumour of arsenic, and also knew of Mr. Bodmer's research. He thought arsenic was not the cause of death, and suggested to the other medical man another cause. He found antimony in his analysis afterwards in various parts of the body, and discovered arsenic in the contents of the stomach. He also found some trace of mercury. The quantity was so small as not to permit him accurately to determine the amount. From the appearance of the body, and of the organs of the body, and

the quantity of arsenic found, death was not due, in his opinion, to arsenic. As to metallic antimony, he found in the contents of the stomach .2 of a grain; in the contents of the bowels, 5.99 grains; in the liver, .71 of a grain; in the kidneys, .14 of a grain; and in the brain, .17 of a grain. There was, therefore, antimony to the extent of 7.24 grains. Antimony in another form was known as tartar-emetic, which was also a poison. It was in the first part of the schedule as indicating that it was a dangerous substance which could only be sold by chemists and registered in the poisons book. It was known as emetic-tartar. In the contents of the stomach there was .64 of a grain; in the contents of the bowels, 16.64; in the liver, 1.98; in the kidneys, .39; and in the brain, 4.7—total, 20.12 grains.

Have you formed any opinion as to the cause of death?—Yes.

And, in your opinion, what was that cause?—She died from antimonial poisoning.

Continuing, the witness said that antimony was a white powder which dissolved in water or other liquid and became perfectly colourless. It had a slight sweet taste, but mixed with wine it would be unnoticeable. It would not necessarily affect the throat. He was of opinion that within a few hours before death the woman drank a large quantity of antimony. He had examined a large number of medicine bottles found at the Crown public-house, and in one he discovered a quantity of antimony. The bottle had apparently also contained bismuth medicine. He could not give the accurate proportion of antimony, but it was about as much as the bismuth. He had also analysed a bismuth powder obtained from Dr. Stoker. There was no trace of antimony or arsenic. Mr. Bodmer assisted him in the analysis.

Wednesday, 17th December, 1902.

Richard Bodmer, public analyst and consulting chemist to the Clinical Research Association, Southwark Street, was recalled, and examined by Mr. Bodkin. He said he was present in Court last Friday when Dr. Stevenson gave his evidence. He assisted Dr. Stevenson in the analysis, and agreed with his evidence.

William Henry Davidson, chemist, residing in Brighton, examined by Mr. Bodkin, said he used to carry on business at High Street, Hastings, and in accordance with the Pharmacy Act he kept a poisons book. It was necessary for a person purchasing poison to sign in that book, and it was usual to state for what purpose the poison was required.

He was in practice at Hastings in April, 1907, and knew a barber's shop in George Street, which was kept by the accused. He had identified the accused from amongst other men that morning. The accused had been to his shop, and he remembered the entry on 3rd April. He was at the accused's shop, and accused asked him if he could have some tartar-emetic, and next morning he bought an ounce at the shop, signing the book, "G. Chapman." Under the heading, "Purpose for which required," the writing was the accused's, and the word looked like "take." The tartar-emetic was a white powder in a wide-mouth bottle. The label produced—upon which was written, "Poison. Dose one-sixth of a grain to a quarter of a grain. To be used with caution"—was in his handwriting, and was upon the bottle. From general conversation he gathered that the accused understood medicines. Of the two books produced one was a book of general recipes. The accused bought both at the shop, and, he thought, another.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney, the witness said he could not say definitely whether the accused's signature was in the poisons book in respect of any other entry. He had, of course, sold tartar-emetic on other occasions. He never filled up a label in that way except in connection with the sale of poison. Tartar-emetic was generally sold for horses.

Florence Rayner, who lived with her parents at Cerise Road, Peckham, was then examined by Mr. Bodkin. She said that in June she was employed by a firm close to the Crown, and occasionally used to visit the public-house about mid-day. She used to talk to the accused and to Maud Marsh, whom she knew as Mrs. Chapman. In the course of conversation she mentioned that she had had some experience of the bar, and on one occasion, at his request, she assisted in the bar one day. The accused then asked her if she would give up her situation and enter the Crown as barmaid at a salary of 5s. per week, with board and lodgings. She consented, and entered his employment about the middle of June. The accused kissed her once or twice. He asked her if she would go to America with him, and she replied, "You have your wife and don't want me." He then snapped his fingers and said, "I could give her *that* and she would be no more Mrs. Chapman." He said that the witness could go on first and he would follow after he had sold the public-house. Three weeks after that Mrs. Chapman was taken ill. The witness left before Mrs. Chapman went to the hospital. The accused and she had their meals first, and then the accused went into the bar whilst Mrs. Chapman had her meals. On several occasions at meal times he asked her if she would go to America with him. The accused was always nice to her. He

said, "Be my sweetheart, will you?" and she said "No." She remembered Mrs. Chapman crying on one occasion because she (Mrs. Chapman) wanted to go out. The accused, who was rather disagreeable, said, "If you go out to-day you will stop out."

Dr. Stoker, who attended Mrs. Chapman, was again recalled to give evidence of handing the bismuth to the police, which was afterwards analysed by Dr. Stevenson.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—The bismuth had been in his possession a fortnight, and was kept in a bottle.

Florence Rayner, continuing her evidence, said that after she left the Crown her next situation was at the Foresters, Peckham. The accused visited her there, and said that Mrs. Chapman had been in the hospital three weeks. He added, "If you had not been such a fool you would have been at the Crown now." She never made any complaint about the accused taking liberties with her.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—With regard to the remark about America, was it not made this way—you were discharged, and did not he say, "You had better go to America"?—No.

You left the Crown under very unpleasant circumstances. Was it not said you were drunk, and you were discharged?—I was not drunk. The drink he gave me made me bad.

Were you not charged at this Court the next day for being drunk?—No, the day after, on the Wednesday. I went to the accused for a reference, and he pushed me out of the house and told me to come when I was sober.

Wednesday, 31st December, 1902.

Detective-Inspector Godley repeated his evidence given at the inquest, and said he also discovered in the accused's room a revolver fully loaded, and a rough kind of diary.

Detective-Sergeant Kemp, M Division, said that while being detained at the police station the accused got up from his seat and asked, "Can I speak to you a minute?" The witness replied in the affirmative, and the accused said, "Your inspector brought some white powders in just now, which he said he found on the drawers in the bedroom. Has the doctor examined them yet?" Then, lowering his head and speaking in a low tone, he said, "I would not hurt her for the world. I have had a lot of trouble with my barmaids, but I took a great fancy to this one. There was some jealousy lately, and she said to me one day, 'I've been with you now

twelve or thirteen months and have not had a baby yet. If I don't soon have one you won't have me with you long.' Her sister would bring her baby with her sometimes, and after she had gone Maud Marsh would sit and cry for a long time."

Alfred Smith, undertaker, of Southwark Bridge Road, said that on 22nd October the accused entered his shop and remarked, "I have got some trouble; I've lost my missus." He asked if the witness knew him; and whether he recollected doing a funeral for him at the Monument. The witness replied in the negative, and added that the funeral referred to was carried out by his manager. The accused also said there was going to be a post-mortem examination on the body, and the witness remarked that he could not remove it without the permission of the coroner's officer.

The accused was now formally charged with the wilful murder of Mary Isabella Spink, the so-called first Mrs. Chapman, a married woman living apart from her husband, and of Bessie Taylor, who had been known as the second Mrs. Chapman.

Mr. Bodkin said that, as the evidence dealing in particular with the death of Maud Marsh was completed, he proposed to make a statement. The accused had been charged with the murder of Mrs. Spink on 25th December, 1897, and of Bessie Taylor, or Chapman, on 13th February, 1901, these two women having each lived with him for some time as his wife. The evidence with regard to the death of Maud Marsh disclosed that the death was caused by the administration of antimony in its soluble form of tartar-emetic; and in the long list of cases which had been decided it had been held that evidence of previous similar cases was relevant to a specific case when the symptoms and the post-mortem appearances were the same. This was decided, for instance, in the case of Mary Ann Gerring, tried in 1849 for the murder of her husband by arsenic, when her three sons were poisoned, and in the charge of murder by arsenic against Flanagan and Higgins, tried at Liverpool in 1884. It would be shown that in the case of Mrs. Spink and Bessie Taylor the symptoms of illness which preceded their deaths were just the same as with Maud Marsh, and the post-mortem appearances gave rise to the inference of antimonial poisoning, and, indeed, the evidence would show that the accused murdered both of them.

In regard to cases of poisoning, it was not altogether remarkable that in a great many of them the persons accused

had belonged to, or had been connected with, the profession of medicine; and, therefore, it was not surprising now to know that the accused himself had passed through various stages of examination in medicine and surgery in Poland, the country from which he came. From certain papers found in his possession it appeared that George Chapman was a name which he had adopted since living in this country, and that his real name was Severin Klosowski. He was born at Warsaw in December, 1865. For five years he served in the Military School and studied to be a doctor and hairdresser, reminding one of the barber surgeons of times gone by. His behaviour seemed to be good, and he was clever at his work. From the copy of a letter which appeared to be in his handwriting, dated December, 1886, it was seen that he asked the chief of the College of Medicine to do him the favour of letting him go up again for examination in order to take a higher degree in medicine. In 1888 the accused came to London, and he became a jobbing hairdresser in Whitechapel. He soon afterwards had a small hairdresser's shop in the Whitechapel Road. In 1889 a woman and two children came over from Warsaw, and there was no reason to doubt that they were his wife and children. He did not consort with them, and they were supported for a time in the neighbourhood. Eventually the accused himself left Whitechapel, and he was next heard of in a barber's shop at Peckham. He later had a small shop in that district himself, but not for long, as it did not pay, and he took up a situation as a hairdresser's assistant in Leytonstone. He was described at this time as a quiet, steady, industrious workman, and earned 30s. per week.

In 1895 the members of a family of Rentons were living at Leytonstone, and one of them, Mary Isabella, married a porter named Shadrach Spink. They were both of intemperate habits, and lived a rather unhappy life. Ultimately Spink left with his son Shadrach, deserting his wife. Two months later the wife gave birth to another child. Then the accused and Mrs. Spink were seen "keeping company" together, and when spoken to by his employer about the matter the accused said, "We are going to be married." One day in October, 1895, the accused and Mrs. Spink went away together, and on their return the accused said they had been to some Jewish place in Whitechapel and there legally married, a tale very much like that told by Maud Marsh to her mother. Mrs. Spink's grandfather left her about £550, which was vested in a trustee by a voluntary deed. During the time she was living with Spink, Mrs. Spink received about £250 of this money; and in 1897 the trustee was induced to hand over the balance to a solicitor employed

by Mr. and Mrs. Chapman. The accused remarked to his landlord that he had experienced some legal difficulty in getting the money. With a portion of this £300 the accused opened a hairdresser's shop at Hastings, where he resided from March, 1896, until February, 1897.

Thereafter they went to live in a Mrs. Greenaway's house in Coburg Place, the child, William, being still with them. Some change had come over the accused's feelings towards Mrs. Spink, and she was heard to complain that he was unkind to her. Bruises and other marks were noticed upon her body. The boy had become weakly, and Mrs. Spink suffered very greatly from vomiting similar to that of Maud Marsh. In July or August, 1897, the accused and Mrs. Spink came to London, and became the tenants of the Prince of Wales beerhouse, St. Bartholomew Square. Mrs. Spink's illness increased, and the accused gave out that she was suffering from delirium tremens. The accused kept her in one room, and apparently tried to prevent all other persons in the house from doing anything for her. She gradually got worse, and death occurred on 25th December, 1897. As with Maud Marsh, the accused was very assiduous in his attentions towards the unfortunate woman, and when she died he went out crying. It was noticed that he used to read medical books, amongst them being "The Family Physician." Asked what he was doing, he remarked, "I am studying a point to stop her drinking. When she gets better I will tell her what I have done to stop it." Notwithstanding his protestations of grief, the public-house was opened as usual at one o'clock. Although the accused must have known of the existence of the relatives of Mrs. Spink at Leytonstone, he did not communicate with them. Dr. Rodgers, who was called in, certified phthisis as the cause of death, probably forming his opinion from the wasted condition of the body. Dr. Rodgers was now dead. The funeral of the woman took place on the 30th of December, 1897; and on 9th December last, nearly five years afterwards, the body was exhumed and examined by Dr. Stevenson and Mr. Bodmer, a skilled chemist. Notwithstanding the long period, it had the appearance of a newly buried corpse. Some of the organs were examined, and tartar-emetic was found to the extent of 3.83 grains.

The accused next advertised for an assistant, and selected Bessie Taylor, a healthy looking woman, aged thirty-two, who had been housekeeper at a Peckham restaurant. They lived at the Prince of Wales until August, 1898, when they moved to the Grapes, Bishops Stortford, staying there until May, 1899, then going to the Monument. Bessie Taylor was taken ill like her predecessor, the symptoms being exactly the same.

Her mother nursed her for a time, and she got better; but she soon had another relapse and died on 13th February, 1901. Dr. Stoker was attending her, and was surprised at the death. There was no suspicion of poison, and after consultation he gave a certificate of death from intestinal obstruction, vomiting, and resulting exhaustion. She was buried at Lymm, Cheshire, and the body was exhumed on 22nd November last. It was well preserved, and a total of 29.12 grains of tartar-emetic was found in the stomach, bowels, liver, and kidneys, a greater quantity even than in the case of Maud Marsh.

Then followed the engaging of Maud Marsh and her death. In each of the three cases the illness and death were the same. Tartar-emetic was a deadly poison which the accused had purchased in such a large quantity at Hastings. It was a little curious that he should have called in Dr. Stoker again; but sometimes persons underestimated the qualifications of others, and perhaps he did not like to run the risk of calling in another doctor. But for the prudent and proper act on the part of Dr. Stoker in getting the persons concerned to consent to a private post-mortem examination, this case would never have been before the Court. It had been suggested that when a doctor was not perfectly clear as to the cause of death he should at once acquaint the coroner's officer, but such a course would be unreasonable and lamentable.

Detective-Inspector GODLEY then gave evidence of charging the accused as Severin Klosowski, *alias* George Chapman, with these two additional murders. He replied, "By what means—stabbing, shooting, or what? I do not know anything about that other fellow" (referring, it seems, to Klosowski).

Wednesday, 7th January, 1903.

When George Chapman again appeared before the Southwark Police Court, on Wednesday, 7th January, 1903, the charge sheets were as follows:—"George Chapman, thirty-six, licensed victualler; for that he did feloniously kill and slay Maud Marsh by administering arsenic to her on 22nd October, 1902, at 213 Borough High Street; Severin Klosowski, thirty-seven, otherwise called George Chapman, His Majesty's Prison, Brixton, publican, feloniously, wilfully, and of malice aforethought killing and murdering Mary Isabella Spink, otherwise called Isabella Chapman, on the 25th day of December, 1897, at the Prince of Wales beer-house, Bartholomew Square; further feloniously, wilfully, and of malice aforethought, killing and murdering Elizabeth (Bessie) Taylor, otherwise called Bessie Chapman, on 13th

February, 1901, at the Monument public-house, parish of St. Saviour."

Mr. Martin O'Connor appeared on behalf of Alfred Clarke, who the year previous had been sentenced to three years' penal servitude on the charge of obtaining £700 from the accused by means of worthless share certificates, and had since received a free pardon. The accused had been served with a writ at the instance of Alfred Clarke for malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, libel, and slander.

Wolff Levisohn, 135 Rosslyn Road, South Tottenham, said he was a traveller in hairdressers' materials. He first met the accused in a shop under the White Hart public-house, 89 High Street, Whitechapel, in 1888. The accused, in the course of conversation, which began by reference to medicine, said his name was Ludwig Zagowski, and that he came from Warsaw. He spoke Polish, mixed with a little Yiddish. Until 1889 the accused was an assistant to a hairdresser at this shop. Then he became proprietor. He stated that he had been a "feldscher," which was a doctor's assistant, at the Praga Hospital, in the suburbs of Warsaw. He appeared to be very clever with medicines.

How come you to say that?—He asked me to get him some medicine once, and I said, "No," as I did not wish to get twelve years.

By Mr. Cecil Chapman—Have you been a "feldscher" yourself?—Yes.

The witness, proceeding, said that at that time the accused was living by himself, but after a time he was joined by a wife and two children. He did not support them, and now and again the witness and another man gave the woman coppers. The witness ceased to see the accused from 1890 until 1894, when he saw him as an assistant at 5 West Green Road, South Tottenham. The wife and two children were not with him then, but another woman. The accused took a shop on weekly payments in South Tottenham. The witness lost sight of him for some little time, and next saw him at a shop opposite Bruce Grove Station. This also was his own shop. He did not see the accused again until after he was in custody. When at Tottenham the accused could talk a little English.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—You saw him at Tottenham. What sort of a man was this Zagowski?—He was a "la de da" then, with black coat, patent boots, and high hat. There he sits. He has not changed a bit; he has not a grey hair in his head. At Tottenham he had two wives—one was English and the other foreign. The latter was not his Polish wife.

You first read about this case in the newspapers?—When I saw it the first time I knew how he got the name of Chapman, but I did not like to push myself forward.

Stanislaus Baderski, a native of Poland, and at that time a tailor at 406 Hoe Street, Walthamstow, said that he first knew the accused thirteen years previously as Severin Klosowski. They first met at a Polish club in St. John's Square, Clerkenwell. The accused was not a member. The witness was living with his sister, Mary Polacryk, who was now dead. He had another sister, named Lucy, who, when she first came to this country, lived with Mary in Green Street, Bethnal Green. Both sisters used to visit the Polish club, and Lucy became acquainted with the accused, who kept a barber's shop at Cable Street. Later he heard of a wedding having been celebrated between Lucy and the accused, and he went to the wedding feast, but was a little late. Lucy told him the marriage took place in Union Street, Whitechapel, on 23rd October, 1889. His sister and the accused lived at Cable Street for about six months, and then took lodgings in Commercial Street. The witness next saw the accused in a barber's shop under a public-house. At that time they were living in Greenfield Street, and Lucy had a son. He next saw them in City Road about ten years ago. Lucy left the accused, and after that he did not know what became of him. Lucy also had a daughter, who was now living. The boy had died. He had not seen the accused from that time until he saw him in the dock—an interval of ten years. The accused had not changed in appearance.

Mrs. Stanislaus Rauch, 292 Burdett Road, said the girl Lucy referred to was her sister. The witness had arrived in this country from German Poland in August, 1889. At that time Lucy was married, her surname being Klosowski. The accused was the husband. When the first child was born they went to America. Lucy returned to England in 1891 without the accused, and lodged with the witness in Scarborough Street. The daughter was then born, and a fortnight later the accused called and remained there. In the course of conversation the accused had told her that he was a Russian Pole, and had been a "feldscher" in the hospital, "Infant Jesus," at Warsaw. She had identified the accused that morning from a number of men.

Joseph Smith Renton, corn chandler, of 460 High Street, Leyton, said his family came from Yorkshire. He had a cousin named Mary Isabella, and if alive she would now be about forty-nine. Her parents died about thirty-two years ago, and she came to live with him and his grandmother.

She became acquainted with Shadrach Spink, a porter at Leytonstone Station, and they were married. Shadrach Spink was not a sober man, and she also was intemperate. They had a son, who was called Shadrach, and a few years later the husband deserted his wife. Soon afterwards she gave birth to another child, named William. Some years later she was keeping company with the accused, who was a hairdresser's assistant in Church Lane. The witness knew him as Chapman. She left Leytonstone in March, 1896, with the accused. The witness was not present at any wedding. He first heard of her death in 1898 from the representative of Dr. Barnardo's Home. Up to that time he and his relations were all living in Leytonstone. Their grandfather left Mary Isabella nearly £600.

By Mr. Cecil Chapman—You saw her a few months after she left Leytonstone?—What name did you know her by?—Mrs. Chapman.

John Ward, 35 Pyrmont Road, Ilford, said that some years ago he lived at Forest Road, Leyton. Mrs. Spink and her son William, about five years of age, went to lodge at his house. He knew the accused, who was working at a local barber's shop, and the accused, a few months later, took a furnished room at his house. On one occasion she said to the accused, "My wife has seen you kissing Mrs. Spink. We cannot allow that sort of thing to go on in the house." The accused replied, "It is all right, Mr. Ward, we are going to get married about Sunday week." That was about October, 1895. In due course they went out together one Sunday morning, the accused stating that they were going to Whitechapel to get married. They returned at night, and the accused said, "Allow me to present you to my wife."

Did he tell you what country he came from?—Yes, Poland.

[At this stage Mr. Bodkin mentioned that in the accused's diary for 27th October, 1895, there was an entry, "Married to Mary Isabella Spink."]

The witness, proceeding, said that on one occasion the accused complained that he was unable to get hold of his wife's money, with which they wanted to buy a business.

Wednesday, 14th January, 1903.

Mrs. Ethel Raydin, Hackney Road, said that some years ago her husband had a hairdresser's business in West India Dock Road, and had an assistant named Klosowski from Warsaw. She recognised the accused as that assistant. On one occasion, she said, the accused showed her some papers in the Russian and Polish languages. He read something

from one of them, and said he had studied at Warsaw as a "doctor's assistant." Her son was ill, and he assisted in nursing him.

Cross-examined by Mr. SYDNEY—This happened fifteen years ago, and the accused stayed in her husband's employ five months. She met him casually in Cheapside three years later. She did not see him again until yesterday. When his name was in the papers as "George Chapman" she did not know who he was, but the previous week she saw his name published as Klosowski. The police afterwards showed her some photographs of him which she recognised.

WILLIAM BRAY, managing clerk to Mr. Braund, solicitor, Gray's Inn Square, said that in December, 1894, the accused consulted him with reference to a shop at High Street, Tottenham. He had identified him among other men in Court that day. He was slightly altered. The accused gave some references, and he eventually took the shop. The agreement (produced) was drawn up and dated 7th January, 1895. His address was given as High Street, Tottenham. He was in the shop about two months, and during that period the witness saw him several times.

Cross-examined by Mr. SYDNEY—He recollected that the accused got a girl into trouble.

GEORGE STERMAN, Nile Street, Hoxton, said he knew the barber's shop under a public-house in High Street, Whitechapel, and about thirteen years ago it was kept by a man with a name like "Klosowski." He had since lost sight of him for several years, next seeing him at Hastings, five years ago. The man then kept a hairdresser's shop, and a short woman used to assist him.

Cross-examined by Mr. SYDNEY—The witness said he was a barber, and called upon hundreds of barbers. He remembered them all for twenty years past.

MRS. HELSDOWN, All Saints Street, Hastings, said that for about five years before January, 1897, she and her husband lived at Hill Street, Hastings. A family came to live in the same house about nine months before. There was a husband, wife, and boy, named Willie. She had that morning identified the accused as the husband, George Chapman. The boy was about four years of age. The accused opened a barber's shop in George Street, and the woman who was known as Mrs. Chapman used to go to the shop each day. They had their meals at the shop. The witness had heard them quarrelling occasionally. Once or twice she saw Mrs. Chapman's face was very red, and she said her husband had smacked her. She was also shown marks on her throat.

Mrs. Chapman, towards the end of the time they were at the witness's house, suffered very much from "dreadful pains and sickness." No doctor ever attended her. The vomit was very green.

Mrs. Harriet Greenaway, Braybrook Road, Hastings, said she used to live at Coburg Place, Hastings. She left the house in March, 1897. About a month before that date a family named Chapman came to live at the house. The family consisted of husband, wife, and child. The accused was the husband. He told the witness that he was a Russian Pole, and had been to America. He did not say much to her, but his wife did. Once he wrote his name down and said, "That is my name in Russian." The witness was not quite sure whether she ever heard it pronounced. On one occasion Mrs. Chapman showed her a little black bag which was kept by the accused. She brought it up secretly. The accused had a revolver in the house. Mrs. Chapman seemed in good health, but she seemed dazed always. After the witness had shown four volumes of Cassell's "Family Physician" to Mrs. Chapman she said her husband wanted to borrow them. She had since often tried to get them back from the accused. The woman whom she knew as Mrs. Chapman was short, dark, and about thirty-two years of age. She wore her hair cut short.

Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Martin, Queen's Road, Hastings, said she was housekeeper at Albyn Mansions, George Street, where the accused had his barber's shop. She recognised him. The shop was given up by him about September, 1897. She saw Mrs. Chapman vomiting a good deal in May. The woman afterwards appeared very poorly, and complained to the witness just before she went away.

Alfred Constable, Murillo Road, Lee, said he used to live at Hastings at the time the accused and Mrs. Chapman had the hairdresser's business. The witness occasionally visited Mrs. Martin, and on one occasion he saw Mrs. Chapman very sick. The vomit was greenish in colour. He first associated the accused with the Chapman he had known by reading the account of the inquest in Maud Marsh's case.

Alice Penfold, Devonshire Road, Hastings, said that about six years ago she was in the employment of a Mrs. Field at Hastings. One Sunday evening while she was out the accused spoke to her and said he was manager to Mr. Slade at the pianoforte shop.

In this way you became somewhat acquainted with him. Did you go out with him again?—Yes, through him calling; I went out with him three times.

Did you complain to him about being ill?—One day he said I looked ill, and I told him I had a bad cold. He said he would give me something to do my cold good, and he added that he had been in a hospital. He sent a note and some powders.

Did you take them?—No, I threw them in the fire.

Proceeding, the witness said that on one occasion, at the accused's request, she accompanied him to St. Leonards to see a public-house which he thought of purchasing. A note she received from him at Hastings was signed "Smith," and in a letter which he sent to her later from London he signed himself as "Chapman." The latter note was sent from the Prince of Wales public-house, St. Luke's, and asked her to go there.

Had you had any previous conversation with him about going to this public-house?—No.

So that the letter was quite a surprise to you?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—The witness said she received three letters from the accused at Hastings, and had destroyed them.

You were going out with him. Why did you destroy them?—I did not want him, but he used to follow me about.

By Mr. Bodkin—Did you ever answer any of the letters?—No.

When you were out together did the accused say whether he was married or not?—I asked him, and he said no.

Mrs. Martha Doubleday, 9 Richmond Street, St. Luke's, said she recollected the accused and Mrs. Chapman (Isabella Spink) going to the Prince of Wales public-house, St. Bartholomew Square. Mrs. Chapman was a short woman, and at that time she was rather stout and had a fresh complexion. The witness was a customer at the house, and they became very friendly. After a time Mrs. Chapman began to look very ill and thin, and at last the accused asked the witness to stay up with her all night. The accused wanted to know who was the nearest doctor, and she gave the name of Dr. Rodgers. The accused then sent her with a note to this gentleman. While the witness stayed up with Mrs. Chapman the accused used to sleep on the couch in the same room. Mrs. Chapman was very sick and complained of pain in the head. The vomiting was very frequent during the night. The witness did not give her any food. The accused used to give her brandy, but not any nourishment while the witness was there. After Mrs. Chapman took the brandy she was very sick.

Proceeding, the witness said she attended Mrs. Chapman about a fortnight at night only. Dr. Rodgers was called in three days after she began. The medicine was prepared

and given by the accused. Mrs. Chapman had diarrhœa in addition to the sickness. When Dr. Rodgers came he and the accused talked together in the bar about Mrs. Chapman. The witness did not know what was the matter with her—she was a mere skeleton—and she asked the accused. He replied that the doctor said she was wasting away. The witness could not stand the fatigue of sitting up night after night, and another nurse was called in. As Christmas, 1897, approached, Mrs. Chapman got worse. Whenever the accused was going to give her any medicine he used to order the witness out of the room. He used to give her neat brandy at night. The last few days of her life she could only retain Liebig's extract, which had been ordered by the doctor. On the morning of Christmas Day the witness asked the accused to go upstairs to look at his wife. She looked in a very serious condition. The accused looked at her, shook his head, and then went downstairs without making any remark. Later the witness saw that she was dying, and she called out, "Chapman, come up quickly. Your wife is dying." He came up soon afterwards, but he was too late, as she had just died. Then he went to the bedside and said, "Polly, Polly, speak." Afterwards he went into the next room and cried, and then went downstairs and opened the public-house. The same day he went to the undertaker's, and on 30th December the funeral took place at St. Patrick's, Leytonstone. Before being placed in the coffin the body was wrapped in the sheet on which it had been lying. The witness did not enter the house again after the funeral. About five months afterwards the witness knew another Mrs. Chapman. She saw her once, when she (Mrs. Chapman) was supposed to get married.

How did you know anything about it?—A neighbour told me.

Detective-Inspector Godley (recalled), produced the certificate of the death of Mrs. Mary Isabella Chapman, which stated that she was forty-one years of age, wife of George Chapman, beerseller, and that she died at Bartholomew Square. The cause of death was certified by Dr. J. F. Rodgers, L.R.C.P., as phthisis.

Wednesday, 21st January, 1903.

Henry Dacre, solicitor, Otley, Yorkshire, said that he acted for Mrs. Spink in the voluntary settlement of between £500 and £600, which had been bequeathed to her. From time to time he made advances to her out of the principal sum. In 1895 he noticed that she signed her letters as "Mrs. Chapman." Afterwards Messrs. Langham, Son & Douglas,

solicitors, Hastings, wrote to him on her behalf, and, in consequence, on 11th June, 1896, he paid over to them £195 for her. After this release there was a balance of £300 remaining of the trust money. Later some correspondence ensued between him and Messrs. Davenport, Jones & Glenister, solicitors, Hastings, and he handed over £298 7s. 11d., the balance of the money, less his expenses.

F. G. Langham, solicitor, Hastings, said that in May, 1896, the accused and Mrs. Chapman consulted him. The latter said that she wished to get an advance out of some trust money for the purpose of embarking in a hairdresser's business at George Street. He had some correspondence with Mr. Dacre, and received £195 from him. His costs were deducted, and £191 17s. was paid by cheque to Mrs. Chapman.

William Joseph Glenister, solicitor, Hastings, gave evidence as to being instructed by the accused and Mrs. Chapman to obtain the balance of the trust money. He received from Mr. Dacre a cheque for £250 and another for £48 7s. 11d. The former he sent to Mrs. Chapman. She opened an account with it at Lloyd's Bank. The other he paid into his own account, and later he sent Mrs. Chapman at the Prince of Wales beerhouse, St. Luke's, a cheque for £33 13s. 7d.

Francis H. Owen, clerk at Lloyd's Bank, Hastings, produced an extract from the account of Mary Isabella Chapman, wife of George Chapman, Albion Mansions, George Street. The account was opened by £250 on 31st August, 1897. On 2nd September £50 was paid out in gold and debited to the account, and on 8th September a cheque for £200 was debited, the amount being afterwards paid out over the counter.

W. J. Clilverd, manager of the London City and Midland Bank, 93 Great Eastern Street, produced an account kept by George Chapman. It was opened on 28th September, 1897, with £230, the notes being the same as those paid over by the Hastings branch of Lloyd's Bank. On 30th September there was a further credit of £55 3s. 7d., which included the cheque of £33 13s. 7d. from Mr. Glenister. On 18th July £50 received by means of a cheque from Warrington was credited to the account, and on 11th August there was a credit of £305. Of the latter amount, £175 was in cash and £130 in notes. That was the last payment in, and made the total amount credited at that date £369 6s. 1d. On 23rd August of the same year the accused drew out the full amount, thus closing the account. This amount was paid

by two £10 notes, one £50 note, two £100 notes, and £99 6s. 1d. in cash.

J. Petrickovski, 30 New Street, Kennington Park Road, said he was acquainted with the Russian language, and he had been handed by Inspector Godley a number of documents in the Russian and Polish languages. They purported to be official documents and certificates relating to a person named Severin Klosowski, and he had made translations. The first was a birth certificate, and the last one, which was dated December, 1886, was written by him asking to be put up for further examinations.

Look at this little book which has been found, can you tell me in which language it has been printed, and the title?—It is in Polish and is, "Five Hundred Prescriptions for Diseases and Complaints."

Is there any name written on the first page?—Yes, "S. Klosowski, 54 Cranbrook Street, Green Street."

Inspector Godley, recalled, stated that he found this book in the boxroom adjoining accused's bedroom at the Crown.

Mrs. Jane Mumford, 72 Bath Street, St. Luke's, said that in 1887 she was living in Bartholomew Square beside the Prince of Wales beerhouse. Mrs. Chapman (Mrs. Spink) looked in good health when she and the accused first took the house, but after a time she complained of feeling unwell, and gradually got worse. For the six days before the death the witness used to assist Mrs. Doubleday in nursing her at night. The accused used to lock the room door at night and sleep on the couch. There was never a fire in the room, although it was December.

Was anything given her at night?—The accused would not allow me to give her anything. He used to give her the medicine in a wineglass—I presumed it was medicine.

Did you ever ask the accused what was the matter with her?—Once I said, "She seems queer," and he said, "She drinks a good deal of brandy."

Have you ever seen him read?—Yes.

What sort of books?—Doctors' books, he said they were. He told me he had been giving her stuff to make her the better of the drink, and when she was recovered he would tell her what he had been giving.

Did he say what he had been?—Something of a doctor on board a ship, I think.

Mrs. Susan Pagett, 105 Coventry Street, Bethnal Green, said that about five years previously her husband was potman at the Prince of Wales, and the witness, at the request of

Mrs. Chapman, went to assist in the house. This Mrs. Chapman was 5 feet high, with short hair and fresh complexion. She told the witness that she felt "very bad" with pains in her head and all over her.

When you first went there did Mrs. Chapman sometimes go into the bar?—Yes, and the accused used to say, "Get out of it, you cannot get drunk here."

Did you ever see her drunk?—No, I never saw her have any drink.

One morning you did not see Mrs. Chapman?—No, and I asked Mr. Chapman if Mrs. Chapman was ill. He said, "Get about your business; she will be back again into the bar to get drunk again." He told me she was "delairious." He gave my husband a card to take round to Dr. Rodgers after I had threatened to bring in the parish doctor.

Did the accused say what kind of "delairious" it was?—He said, "delairious tremens after drink." My husband and I went to live in the house.

When you got in Mrs. Chapman called you?—Yes.

Did she ask you to look at a glass?—Yes.

Was there anything in it?—Yes, something like water.

Did you have any conversation with Mr. Chapman about it?—Yes, I told him that Mrs. Chapman had told me that he had put a red powder in her medicine, as her medicine was white. He smiled, and said, "I told you before that she is 'delairious'; you must take no notice of it." I said, "Delairious or not, I quickly moved in and I can quickly move out," and I did so.

Did your husband say anything to Mr. Chapman?—He said, "Mr. Chapman, if you have no respect for your wife and want to kill her, I have respect for mine, and you won't kill her."

Mrs. Elizabeth Waymark, 41 Windsor Terrace, City Road, said that Dr. Rodgers spoke to her, and about a fortnight before the death of Mrs. Chapman she went to nurse her. Mrs. Chapman was in a terrible condition. The witness never gave her any nourishment or medicine; they were all administered by the accused himself. She had seen the accused give her brandy and milk which he had previously mixed.

When the accused gave her anything did he do anything?—He used to go up to the bedside and feel her pulse. I sometimes said, "She is very bad," and he would reply, "Yes, I know what to do." She used to say, "Do, do, kiss me," and he would take her hand. She used to be very thirsty at night, and the accused used to give her a white liquid like milk.

Did she get better or worse?—After the sickness she used to go off into a stupor.

Proceeding, the witness said that on the day Mrs. Chapman died the accused entered the room several times, looked at the woman, and felt her pulse. The witness felt her pulse and found that it was very low—scarcely beating. She got worse and worse, and the witness sent for the accused. He did not go up at once, and he was too late, the woman dying in the meantime. On 9th December last the witness was at the cemetery when the exhumation took place, and identified the body. While she was at the Prince of Wales there was a little boy there named Willie, aged about seven years.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney—Did the accused seem kind and attentive to her?—Not very kind.

Tolerably, like married people generally are?—Not like you do see man and wife.

John Klaiber, vacation clerk at Dr. Barnardo's Homes, said that on 30th January, 1898, a man named Chapman saw him about a little boy named Willie Spink. He handed the inquiry to Mr. Stringer.

William Henry Stringer, inquiry officer at Dr. Barnardo's Homes, said that he called at the Prince of Wales beerhouse and saw the accused, who said that Mrs. Spink had died at this house on Christmas Day, and he wanted to get her boy into Dr. Barnardo's Homes. He said the boy had no relations. "I think he gave me some addresses," added witness, "but they were false ones."

Did you go to Leytonstone?—Yes, I went to the Rentons, but I do not recall who gave me their address.

Did you make a report after you made your inquiries?—Yes. The boy was not taken into the home.

By Mr. Cecil Chapman—Did you go back to Chapman and tell him that you found all his statements untrue?—No, it was not my business.

Ernest Sibley, 204 Hoxton Street, relieving officer for the parish of St. Leonards, Shoreditch, said that about 20th March, 1899, he received an application with regard to a boy named Willie Spink, aged ten years, of 8 Haberdasher Street, Shoreditch. George Chapman made the application, and gave the mother's name as Isabella Spink, and the date of her death. He told the witness that the husband had deserted her. The references given by Chapman were Miss E. Painter, of Dufferin Street, and Bessie Taylor, his housekeeper, at 8 Haberdasher Street. The boy was admitted to Shoreditch workhouse.

Wednesday, 28th January, 1903.

Dr. Thomas Stevenson, analyst to the Home Office, examined by Mr. Bodkin, said that on 9th December, 1902, he was present at St. Patrick's Cemetery, Leytonstone, and examined the body, which was in a coffin bearing a plate upon which was inscribed "Mary Isabella Chapman, died 25th December, 1897, aged 41 years."

Speaking generally, was there anything in the condition of the body which, in your opinion, would account for death?—No, except acute gastro-enteritis. I found in the stomach and bowels evidence of acute gastro-enteritis.

Did you find any evidence that she had been a hard drinker?—The inflammation of the stomach was far beyond that which would be caused by alcoholism. From the condition of the liver and kidneys, I should not suspect that she had been a drinker. In all of the organs I found antimony.

Proceeding, the witness said in the form of metallic antimony he found 0.3 of a grain in the stomach, 0.41 in the bowels, 0.87 in the liver, and 0.6 in the kidneys—a total of 1.37. Applying the same rule of conversion as he had applied in the case of Maud Marsh, this represented in tartar-emetic, the soluble form of antimony, 0.8 of a grain in the stomach, 1.15 in the bowels, 2.42 in the liver, and 1.8 in the kidneys—a total of 3.83 grains. This antimonial compound would account for the appearance of gastro-enteritis in the body. The largest amount was in the liver, larger than in the case of Maud Marsh. In that case it was practically 2 grains, and here it was practically 2½ grains. After a fatal dose had been administered a person would live three or four days.

What was the immediate cause of death in this case?—Gastro-enteritis set up by antimony, and the symptoms in this case—I have not heard the evidence—were nausea, vomiting, pain in the abdomen, burning at the back of the throat, and thirst. The death certificate stated that she died from phthisis, but she did not have phthisis.

Is there anything to account for the remarkable state of preservation in which you found the body after five years of interment?—Antimony does preserve a body. A dry, mummified appearance has been observed before in exhumations. This case is quite unique, as I cannot find another exhumation after five years.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hutton—Cases of antimonial poisoning are rare at the present day. In the 'fifties and 'sixties there were many cases. The last important one was that of Mr. Bravo, who died in 1876. Antimony remained

in the body so long as the coffin was good—while the body remained dry. In the case of Ann Palmer, who died from antimonial poisoning in 1854, there was the same mummified appearance of the body after fifteen months.

Detective-Inspector GODLEY produced a death certificate in which death of Bessie Taylor was stated to be intestinal obstruction, vomiting, and exhaustion. Her name was given as Bessie Chapman, her age thirty-six, and it was stated that death took place on 13th February, 1901. He also produced a photograph of her which he found at the Crown, in a box marked "B. T."

Detective-Sergeant NEIL said he had searched the Register of Marriages, and had been unable to trace any record of a marriage between the accused and Bessie Taylor or Mrs. Spink.

ELIZABETH PAINTER, caretaker, Argyle Street, Oxford Street, gave evidence as to Taylor, a fellow-servant, having enjoyed good health before her "marriage" to the accused, but after that her health failed. They left the Prince of Wales, where they lived seven years previously, and went to the Grapes, Bishops Stortford. The witness visited Taylor there, and found that she had gone into hospital. She next saw them at the Monument, Union Street, Borough. Mrs. Chapman was failing very much. As the time got nearer to February, 1901, her health got worse, her face became long and thin, and she was attended by Dr. Stoker. She used to take a little food, which was prepared by the accused. She suffered from sickness directly after she took food, followed by exhaustion. The accused used to feel her pulse, at the same time looking at his watch. On 14th February, when the witness called, she saw the accused and the nurse in the bar parlour. Asked if Mrs. Chapman was any better, the accused said, "She is much about the same." The nurse then told the witness of the death.

MARTHA ELIZABETH IBBS, a sister attached to All Hallows Mission, Union Street, said that during the illness of Mrs. Chapman at the Monument she used to visit her frequently. The woman was almost always in bed and complained of abdominal pains, sickness after food, and exhaustion. As time went on her face became worn, drawn, and wasted.

Mrs. MARTHA STEVENS, nurse, Fanshaw Avenue, Barking, said in December Dr. Stoker visited Mrs. Chapman at the Crown and examined her. The witness then commenced to nurse her, and from a week after Christmas until the date of the death stayed in the house. She appeared to get better

and got up. She went to the piano and played a little. Dr. Stoker came in and remarked, "Capital," appearing very pleased with her condition. The witness went home that night, and the second day following was sent for again. The patient seemed in a burning heat; the pains were very violent. Dr. Stoker seemed surprised. The vomiting and purging were more frequent. On the early morning of 14th February she was dying, and the witness called the accused. He came in just as she had died. He did not seem very much upset. The body was removed on 15th February. The witness stayed in the house a little longer until a woman appeared in response to an advertisement. This woman the witness knew as "Madam."

Wednesday, 4th February, 1903.

Detective-Inspector Godley, recalled, said that on 22nd November, 1902, he was present in the churchyard at Lymm, Cheshire, when the family grave of Thomas P. Taylor was opened, in pursuance of an order made by the Home Secretary. Three coffins were taken out; the first contained the body of Betsy Taylor, the second that of Thomas P. Taylor, and the inscription on the third was, "Bessie Chapman, died 13th February, 1901, aged 36." Among the papers found by the police at the Crown were a memorial card to Bessie Chapman, the undertaker's account for the funeral, certain letters from Mrs. Taylor to the accused, a draft letter in reply, a telegram from Mr. Taylor relating to the funeral arrangements, and documents in reference to the purchase, and later the sale, of the Grapes public-house, Bishops Stortford.

William Tull, 11 Warwick Street, Blackfriars, manager to Mr. Smith, undertaker, 122 Southwark Bridge Road, said that on 13th February, 1901, he took a coffin to the Monument public-house, Union Street, Borough. He saw the accused, who showed him the body of a woman lying in a room on the top floor. The accused gave the name of the woman as Bessie Chapman, and told the witness he was to be ready at 7 a.m. on the 15th to convey the body to St. Pancras Station. The witness did this, meeting the accused and Mr. William Taylor at the railway station. On 22nd November he was present at the exhumation of the coffin, which he identified by the inscription plate, which he had himself engraved. Dr. Stevenson was in attendance, and the witness removed the lid, but could not identify the body.

William Kelsal, farmer, Agden, near Altrincham, Cheshire, said he was acquainted with Thomas Taylor and

his daughter Bessie. He was present at the exhumation, and recognised the body of Bessie.

William Taylor, salesman, 62 Lausanne Road, Hornsey, said that the woman Bessie Taylor was his sister. After leaving him she was manageress at restaurants in London and other places for about ten years.

By Mr. Sims—One word as to money matters. Was your sister a careful woman in money matters?—Yes, very careful and saving.

Proceeding, the witness said accused and his sister went to Bishops Stortford, and he had a letter from his sister asking him to send her some fruit at the hospital at Bishops Stortford. He saw them again in London after they had taken the Monument public-house. About December, 1900, he went to the Monument to see his sister. He found her very ill.

How was she in appearance?—Thin; like a little, old woman.

When did you last see her alive?—A week before her death.

Who paid the funeral expenses?—I did. The accused had not got sufficient money—at least, that is what he said.

After the funeral, when did you next see him?—In July, 1902, he called at my place. He said he had just been to the brewers. It was just after my father's death, and I remember asking if he had heard about it. He said he was very sorry to hear of the loss, and mentioned that he had a law case on about a lot of money.

This cheque for £50 which was paid into the accused's banking account was made out by your father in favour of your sister?—Yes.

Was your father tolerably well to do?—Yes, and my mother had a separate estate.

Your sister was a favourite daughter?—Yes, especially on my father's side.

After her death he made a fresh will?—Yes.

I take it your sister did not appear in that?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. Jenkins—Do you know the contents of the first will?—No.

Do you know whether she was mentioned in it?—Yes, she was.

Frederick Thomas Sanderson, bailiff, Bishops Stortford, said he remembered the accused and his wife taking the Grapes public-house in August, 1898. For some time Mrs. Chapman appeared to be in good health, and then she complained of toothache and an abscess. After she had gone into the hospital the accused asked the witness where he could get some will forms. He mentioned two stationers' shops; and later in the day the accused showed him a form headed "This

is my last will and testament," mentioning that he wanted his wife to make a will.

By Mr. Sims—How was the accused's manner towards his wife?—All right at first, and then very brusque.

Dr. James Morris Stoker, L.R.C.S., 221 New Kent Road, said he first made the acquaintance of the accused in January, 1901, at the Monument public-house, Union Street. Some time before that Mrs. Chapman had consulted him, complaining of dyspepsia. She called four or five times at his surgery, and he gave her medicine on each occasion. He had no record of the prescriptions. On 1st January, 1901, he was called to attend her at the public-house, and from then almost daily he visited her until 13th February, when she died. She was being nursed by Mrs. Stevens. He prescribed a milk diet, and also medicines for the sickness, but he could not say now what they were composed of. He made inquiries, but could not find any explanation for the illness, and in consequence he had a consultation with other medical men. He saw the accused on almost every visit, and spoke to him about the desirability of a consultation, as he could not get any improvement in the case. The accused agreed. He had three consultations—first with Dr. Sutherland, of Cavendish Square, a specialist in diseases of women. Mrs. Chapman did not make any improvement, but, on the contrary, got worse. The second consultation followed with a doctor in Southwark Bridge Road, whose name the witness could not recollect. This doctor was inclined to think that the illness was due to hysteria. Mrs. Chapman still kept getting worse, and the witness asked for a third consultation. The accused agreed, and Dr. Cotter was called in. His opinion was that the illness was due to malignant disease of the intestines. The witness remembered on one occasion finding Mrs. Chapman playing the piano in the clubroom. He waited until she had finished playing, and then approached. She told him she felt very much better, and he told her he would not call again until he was sent for. The next day, or the day after, he was sent for, and he found her condition as bad as ever. Acting on the suggestion of Dr. Cotter, he had some of the vomit analysed by the Clinical Research Association, but the result did not help him to understand the cause. He last saw the woman alive on 12th February; she was then dying. He afterwards gave a certificate that death was due to intestinal obstruction, vomiting, and exhaustion.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hutton, the witness said that he did not know what medicines he gave her. He might have given her Rochelle salts.

If you commenced with that you would continue it?—Not if it acted properly.

Hysteria might mean anything?—Anything at all.

Or nothing. A doctor cannot go far wrong if he describes toothache or constipation as hysteria. What was meant by malignant disease of the intestines?—Some cancerous disease in the stomach or intestines.

Did the accused appear to take an interest in her welfare?—Oh, yes; he was in the room every time I visited her.

Do you remember, after the three consultations, the accused saying he would like to have the best specialist in London called in?—No. I should probably have remembered it if he had, and agreed to it.

To the best of your recollection, the medicines you gave were taken?—Yes.

Did you order her brandy?—Probably.

Re-examined by Mr. Bodkin—Did you ever examine the contents of the medicine bottles after they left your surgery?—No.

From first to last was there any thought of poison present in your mind?—None whatever.

Dr. Thomas Stevenson, examined by Mr. Bodkin, said he made a post-mortem examination of the body of Bessie Chapman after its exhumation. The tissues were firm. The lungs were shrunken, but otherwise normal, the heart healthy, and there was a red patch on the mucous membrane of the stomach, but there was no sign of loss of substance, ulceration, or perforation. The inner surface of the bowels was coated with yellow and orange patches like paint. The other organs were normal. There was no sign of cancer or any appearance of natural disease to account for death.

Speaking generally, was the body in a good state of preservation?—Internally, but the surface was not.

Proceeding, witness said that the red patches referred to indicated gastro-enteritis. This aroused his suspicion, as it suggested mineral poisoning. In every part of the intestines and organs which he removed for analysis he discovered antimony. In the stomach, bowels, liver, and kidneys he found 10.49 grains of metallic antimony. Calculated as tartar-emetic, the soluble form of antimony, he found 3.2 grains in the stomach, 23.43 in the bowels, 4.55 in the liver, and 8.2 in the kidneys. From the distribution of antimony through the various organs, he judged that it had been taken in a soluble form, and the highest probability was that it was tartar-emetic. A large dose must have been taken within three hours of death.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hutton—Did you form any idea as to how many doses had been taken?—No.

The smaller the dose the longer the time it would take to become fatal?—As a rule.

Is antimony prescribed as a medicine?—Yes.

Is it possible for persons to buy it in an ordinary quack medicine?—It has been in some advertised quack remedies.

What was it taken for?—To my knowledge, as a cure for drink.

A tonic?—No, but to make people sick. These remedies have not been sold for that purpose for some years.

Wednesday, 11th February, 1903.

Mr. Sims—Since the last hearing I have had the opportunity of considering the evidence of the three doctors called in consultation by Dr. Stoker. It is not necessary to call them here, and if it is necessary to call them hereafter I will give Mr. Sydney notice. I now ask for the committal of the accused on the three charges.

Mr. Chapman, having in the customary form asked the accused if he had anything to say——

Mr. Sydney said the accused pleaded "not guilty." He reserved his defence, and called no witnesses at this stage.

Mr. Chapman committed the accused for trial at the next Old Bailey Sessions.

APPENDIX III.

Translations of Documents, in Russian and Polish, found in Chapman's possession on the occasion of his arrest.

(1)

"*Extract from birth certificate, Civil Register, Roman Catholic denomination, issued from Parish Register of Kolo.*

"On the 15th day of December, 1865, at ten o'clock in the morning, there appeared Antonio Klosowski, 30 years of age, a carpenter by trade, native of the village of Nagornak, together with two witnesses, Ludwika Zywanski, aged 32, and Jacob Rozinski, aged 56, both of Nagornak, and employed there. They stated that Emilie, the wife of Antonio Klosowski, *née* Ulatowski, aged 29, had given birth to a child the previous morning. The child was named Severin and that his parents are Polish subjects. The godfather of the child was Ludwig Zyanski and the godmother's name was Marianna Colimowski. That they were present at the birth and that they affixed their signatures hereto in testimony thereof."

(Then follow the signatures of the Clerical Registrar of Kolo, the Chief of the Parochial Registry of Kolo, and a magistrate of Kolo.)

(2)

"This is given by the teacher of the Krasseminsk rural public primary school, consisting of one Standard, to the effect that Severin Klosowski, son of Antonio, attended the Krasseminsk School from October 17-29, 1873, till June 6-13, 1880, and completed the full term of studies of the first department, and that his conduct throughout his attendance at the school was very good.—In witness thereof I affix my own signature, Merkish, teacher, village of Krassenin, December 7-19, 1880."

(The authenticity of the signature of Merkish is attested by two witnesses.)

(3)

"Receipt for one rouble, paid by Rappaport to the Treasury of the Society of Surgeons of the town of Radom on behalf of the surgical apprentice, Severin Klosowski.

"Radom, October 23-November 5, 1882.—N. BRODNITSKI, Senior Surgeon."

(4)

"The magistrate of the County of Zvolen hereby certifies that Severin Klosowski, resident of the village Zvolen, is a well-behaved man, and was never found guilty of any crime whatever. To which effect he bears testimony by his own signature and official seal.—DUSHEVITCH, Magistrate of the County, Village Zvolen, November 16, 1882."

(5)

"Certificate issued to the surgical apprentice, Severin Antonio Klosowski, to the effect that he, Severin Klosowski, was in my surgery for the purpose of studying surgery from December 1, 1880, till June 1, 1885, and during the whole of the time he, Severin Klosowski, discharged accurately all his duties. He was diligent, of exemplary conduct, and studied with zeal the science of surgery.—In testimony thereof I affix my signature, MOSHKO RAPPAPORT, Senior Surgeon and proprietor of the surgery in the village Zvolen, June 1, 1885."

(6)

"Certificate issued to Severin Klosowski, resident in the village of Tyminitsa, county of Nodga, district of Iltetsk, Government of Radom, to the effect that he was employed for a period of four-and-a-half years by the local surgeon, Moshko Rappaport, in the capacity of a practising surgery pupil, and under the doctor's instructions rendered very skilful assistance to patients—*i.e.*, in cupping by means of glasses, leeches, and other assistance comprised in the science of surgery. To all the above I am able to testify as an eye-witness.—(Signed) O. P. OLSTETSKI, medical practitioner in village of Zvolen, October 10-22, 1885."

(7)

"October 23-November 4, 1885.—The Radom Surgical Society, of the town of Radom, hereby certifies that the surgical pupil, Severin Klosowski, was entered at the registry of surgical pupils by the Senior Surgeon, Moshko Rappaport, in the town of Radom, November 22-December 3, 1882. Subject No. 8, and in accordance with Article 17, letter b, of the Surgical Society. One rouble in silver

was paid by him into the Treasury of the said Society.—In witness whereof, BRODINSKI, the Chief of the Society, testifies by affixing his signature and the seal of the Surgical Society."

(8)

"This is given to Severin Klosowski, surgery pupil, to the effect that from October 1, 1885, till January 1, 1886, he received instructions in practical surgery at the Hospital of Praga, Warsaw, and his general conduct was good.—(Signed) KRYNICK, Senior Surgeon.

"In accordance with the application of Severin Klosowski, and in consequence of inquiries ordered to be made, the present certificate is issued from the office of the Chief of Police of Warsaw to the effect that the applicant while residing in Warsaw was not observed by the police to be concerned in any improper conduct whatsoever. The present certificate is given to Mr. Klosowski under the proper signature and Government seal for the purpose of submitting the same to the Imperial University of Warsaw. Stamp duties have been collected.—Warsaw, April 29, 1886. KASIEVITZ, Deputy Chief of the Department. (Seal) A. DARENSKOV, Manager."

(9)

A receipt from the Surgical Society "For entering the name of Severin Klosowski, two roubles."

(10)

"Warsaw, November 15, 1886.—This is to certify that Severin Klosowski has been employed by me as surgeon assistant from January 20, 1886, up to the present time, and during the whole of that period he performed his surgical functions with a full knowledge of the subject, and his conduct was good. To this fact I testify with my own signature, and affix my stamp.—(Signed) D. MOSHKOVSKI."

(11)

"I was born in 1865, in the village of Nagornak, district of Kolo, Government of Kalish I lived with my parents until the age of 15, attending at the same time the primary school. In 1880 my parents apprenticed me for the purpose of studying surgery to Moshko Rappaport, senior surgeon of the town of Zvolen. Having served my term of apprenticeship till 1885, I came to Warsaw, and whilst employed by Mr. V. Olshanski I also attended a practical course of surgery at the Praga Hospital. Upon the termination of my hospital practice I entered the service of Mr. D.

Moshkovski, by whom I am still employed. I present here with all my documents.—Yours faithfully, Severin Klosowski. Warsaw, November 15, 1886."

(The document bears the stamp value 15 kopecks.)

(12)

"PASSPORT, given on November 24, 1886, to Severin Antonovich Klosowski, residing in the Radom Government, district of Ilshetsk, county of Khotche, village of Tyshenitsa, Nova Nil to travel to the city of Warsaw from the above date till November 1-13, 1887, upon the expiration of which the said document shall be returned to me. The civil and military authorities shall allow the bearer a free passage, and if necessary render him legal assistance. Given in Khotche, November 24, 1886. Physical description. Age, 21; born in 1865; height, medium; hair, of a dark shade; eyes, blue; nose and mouth, medium; chin and face, longish; birthmarks, none.

"Passport within the limits and the Kingdom of Poland. Free.—(Signed) MAZUR, Magistrate of the County of Khotche. (Seal) GODLEVSKI, County Clerk."

(This was given to Klosowski on his recruiting in 1886.)

(13)

"Warsaw, December, 1886.—His Excellency, the Dean of the Medical Faculty of the Imperial University of Warsaw.

"Petition from Severin Klosowski, surgical pupil, residing at No. 16 Muranovskaja Street.

"I have the honour to request your Excellency to grant me permission to undergo the examination for the purpose of receiving the degree of Junior Surgeon. I enclose herewith the required documents.—Yours faithfully, SEVERIN KLOSOWSKI."

(14)

"Town of Praga, November 24 to December 6, 1886.—I hereby certify that Severin Klosowski was employed by me in the capacity of an assistant surgeon from August 20, 1885, till February 1, 1886, and during the whole of the time he fulfilled the whole of his duties with zeal, and was of good behaviour. In witness whereof I have affixed my own signature.—(Signed) C. F. OLSHANSKI."

(15)

"Ministry of Interior, Medical Administration of Warsaw, December 5, 1886.—In consequence of the application presented by Severin Klosowski, surgical pupil, the Medical

Administration hereby testify to the effect that they do not see any reason to oppose his receiving the degree of a Junior Surgeon. The required stamp duties have been paid.—(Signed) Dr. M. Oreszaief, Collegiate Councillor and Inspector. A. Pominski, Secretary."

(16)

"Severin Klosowski has paid to the Treasury of the Warsaw Society of Assistant Surgeons, Hospital fees four roubles per month.—Warsaw, February 28, 1887. Cobalski, Senior Surgeon. Paid up till March 3, 1887."

- APR 10